

JAN 10 1928

The CLASSICAL QUARTERLY and CLASSICAL REVIEW are the organs of the Classical Association. The QUARTERLY is published in January, April, and October (double number); the REVIEW in February, May, July, September, November, and December.

The Classical Review

PERIODICAL ROOM
GENERAL LIBRARY
UNIV. OF MICHIGAN

EDITORS { E. HARRISON, M.A., Trinity College, Cambridge.
Prof. W. M. CALDER, LL.D., 5, Derby Road, Withington, Manchester.

All correspondence should be addressed to Prof. CALDER. Books for review should be sent to the Publisher.

Board of Management :

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| Prof. J. P. DOBSON, M.A., <i>Chairman.</i> | L. WHIBLEY, M.A., <i>Hon. Secretary.</i> | |
| Prof. A. C. CLARK, Litt.D., F.B.A., <i>Hon. Treasurer.</i> | | |
| Prof. R. S. CONWAY, Litt.D., F.B.A. | E. A. BARBER, M.A., <i>representing the Oxford Philological Society.</i> | |
| Prof. H. WILLIAMSON, M.A. | Prof. D. S. ROBERTSON M.A., <i>representing the Cambridge Philological Society.</i> | |

With the co-operation of Prof. E. K. RAND, Harvard University, and Prof. W. RITCHIE, University of Cape Town.

Vol. XLII

DECEMBER, 1928

No. 6

CONTENTS

| | PAGE | | PAGE |
|--|------|--|---------|
| NOTES AND NEWS | 209 | REVIEWS (continued) : | |
| SOME ASPECTS OF DRAMATIC IRONY IN SOPHOCLEAN TRAGEDY. S. K. JOHNSON .. | 209 | <i>Emporos</i> (Knorringa). K. M. T. CHRIMES | 228 |
| THE PRIORITY OF THE Mercator. W. BEARE | 214 | <i>Introduction to the Study of the Greek Dialects</i> (Buck). S. G. CAMPBELL .. | 229 |
| LUCRETIVS V. 1341-9. R. B. ONIANS .. | 215 | <i>Die Griechisch-Orientalische Romanliteratur</i> (Kerényi). D. S. ROBERTSON .. | 230 |
| TACITUS, <i>Annals</i> IV. 12. E. C. MARCHANT | 217 | <i>Epochs of Greek and Roman Biography</i> (Stuart). M. CARY .. | 232 |
| HORACE, <i>Ep.</i> I. 6, 5-8. W. S. MAGUINNESS | 219 | <i>Lateinische Grammatik</i> , I., II. (Stolz-Schmalz, etc.). J. FRASER .. | 232 |
| CHARITO I. 3, 5. R. M. RATTENBURY .. | 219 | <i>The Etruscans</i> (Randall-MacIver). R. S. CONWAY .. | 233 |
| REVIEWS : | | <i>Cicero : Pro lege Manilia, etc.</i> (Hodge). G. B. A. FLETCHER .. | 236 |
| <i>The Mission of Greece</i> (Livingstone). N. C. SMITH .. | 219 | <i>Die Geschichte des Sallusttextes im Altertum</i> (Höhne). S. K. JOHNSON .. | 236 |
| <i>Asiatic Elements in Greek Civilisation</i> (Ramsay). W. M. CALDER .. | 221 | <i>Statius</i> (Mozley). H. STEWART .. | 237 |
| <i>A Handbook of Greek Mythology</i> (Rose). W. R. HALLIDAY .. | 222 | <i>Les Antiquités romaines de la Rhénanie</i> (Colin). R. G. COLLINGWOOD .. | 238 |
| <i>The Hippias Major</i> (Tarrant). W. R. M. LAMB .. | 222 | SHORT REVIEWS | 238-245 |
| <i>Isocrates, with an English translation</i> (Norlin). M. L. W. LAISTNER .. | 223 | SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS | 245 |
| <i>Aristoteles, 'Ἀθηναίων Πολιτεία</i> (Oppermann). A. W. GOMME .. | 224 | BOOKS RECEIVED | 246 |
| <i>Psychology Ancient and Modern</i> (Brett). A. E. TAYLOR .. | 226 | INDEX | 247 |
| <i>Lysippos</i> (Johnson). E. A. GARDNER .. | 227 | | |

LONDON : JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE STREET, W.

NEW YORK : G. E. STECHERT & CO., 31-33, EAST 10TH STREET.

Price of the present Number, 3s. net. Yearly Subscription, 12s. net, post free; U.S.A. \$3. Combined Yearly Subscription for the CLASSICAL QUARTERLY and the CLASSICAL REVIEW, 25s. net, post free; U.S.A. \$6.25.

THE CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION

THE objects of the Classical Association are to promote the development and maintain the well-being of classical studies, and in particular (a) to impress upon public opinion the claim of such studies to an eminent place in the national scheme of education; (b) to improve the practice of classical teaching; (c) to encourage investigation and call attention to new discoveries; (d) to create opportunities for intercourse among lovers of classical learning.

Membership of the Association is open to men and women alike. The annual subscription is 5s. (life composition, £3 15s.), and there is an entrance fee of 5s. (not charged to Libraries). Members receive a copy of the annual *Proceedings* of the Association and, on payment of 2s. 6d., of *The Year's Work in Classical Studies* (both post free). They may also obtain the *Classical Review* and *Classical Quarterly* at reduced prices, provided that the subscriptions be paid before January 31st in each year. Subscriptions sent in later than that date must be at the rates offered to the general public.

Inquiries and applications for membership should be addressed to the Hon. Treasurer, Mr. H. F. Hose, Dulwich College, S.E. 21; or to either of the Hon. Secretaries, Dr. E. Norman Gardiner, 186, Woodstock Road, Oxford, and Miss E. C. Gedge, Crayford Rectory, Kent; or to the Hon. Secretary of any of the district Branches—viz., Mr. W. Beare, The University, Manchester; Dr. G. A. Auden, Education Office, Margaret Street, Birmingham; Mr. R. B. Onians, The University, Liverpool; Professor Granger, University College, Nottingham; Mr. H. A. Pitman, 4, Prince's Buildings, Bristol; Mr. Basil Anderton, The Public Library, New Bridge Street, Newcastle-upon-Tyne; Miss E. J. Vaughan, Westfield College, Hampstead; Mr. L. J. D. Richardson, Fernshaw, Hilary Road, Llanishen, Cardiff; Mr. E. E. Bibby, The University, Leeds; Mrs. Jackson, The Cottage, Cordwell Valley, Holmesfield, Nr. Sheffield; Mr. E. D. T. Jenkins, University College, Aberystwyth; Miss M. E. Lees, University College, Bangor; Miss M. K. Wakefield, Maidstone Girls' Grammar School, Kent; Mr. S. Price, 33, Walton Well Road, Oxford; Mr. J. M. Gaussen, 16, Lewes Crescent, Brighton; Mr. G. W. Dyson, University College, Southampton; Mr. F. Fletcher, University College, Exeter; Mr. C. W. Baty, 49, Waterloo Road, Bedford; and Mr. J. E. Scott, Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge.

The Loeb Classical Library

Edited by T. E. PAGE, Litt.D., E. CAPPS, Ph.D., LL.D.,
and W. H. D. ROUSE, Litt.D.

Each volume, Foolscap 8vo, 400–600 pages. Clear type. Cloth, 10s. net. Leather, 12s. 6d. net.

A series of Greek and Latin Texts, with English Translations on the opposite page. The Series is to contain all that is best in Greek and Latin Literature, from the time of Homer to the end of the Western Empire.

'We shall never be independent of our Loeb.'—TIMES LIT. SUPP.

New Volumes Ready December, 1928

Lucan. Translated by J. D. DUFF.

Cicero: Letters to his Friends. Translated
by W. GLYNN WILLIAMS. In 3 Vols.
Vol. II.

Cicero: Verrine Orations. Translated by
L. H. G. GREENWOOD. In 2 Vols.
Vol. I.

Athenaeus: The Deipnosophists. Translated
by C. B. GULICK. In 7 Vols. Vol. II.

Epictetus. Translated by W. A. OLDFATHER.
In 2 Vols. Vol. II.

Oppian, Colluthus, and Tryphiodorus.
Translated by A. W. MAIR.

Plutarch: Moralia. Translated by F. C.
BABBITT. In 14 Vols. Vol. II.

Procopius: History of the Wars. Trans-
lated by H. B. DEWING. In 7 Vols.
Vol. V.

Descriptive Prospectus on Application to

WILLIAM HEINEMANN, Windmill Press, Kingswood, Tadworth, Surrey

U
celeb
22nd
and
prep
writ
the

SOL

I
criti
the
not
bet
The
emp
ma
ma
giv
till
ma
kn
ter
tin
tw
tar
sec
co
ex
an
as
m
m
w
pl
b
k

T
in
an
le
(
h
(
p
t

The Classical Review

DECEMBER, 1928

NOTES AND NEWS

Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf celebrates his eightieth birthday on the 22nd December. His pupils, colleagues, and friends are to mark the occasion by preparing and publishing a list of all his writings, accompanied by indices of all the passages in ancient authors and

documents discussed by Wilamowitz, and a list of Stichwörter referring to all the discussions of linguistic and other points of scholarship scattered about in his publications. It will be both a useful and a bulky volume; may it soon be in need of a supplement.

SOME ASPECTS OF DRAMATIC IRONY IN SOPHOCLEAN TRAGEDY.

It is a commonplace of dramatic criticism that in a 'good' play much of the interest of the spectator is kept alive not by mere curiosity, but by an alliance between the dramatist and the audience. There are, I think, two methods widely employed by the good dramatic craftsman who produces this alliance. He may, by using the art of 'preparation,' give us hints of what is going to happen till we find ourselves expecting it, or he may remind us of something which we know, but of which some of the characters in the play are ignorant. Sometimes, as often in Greek Tragedy, the two methods are seen at work simultaneously. But it is obvious that the second method—to which this paper is confined—was employed to a far greater extent by the Greek tragedians than by any modern dramatist.¹ Some curiosity as to details was no doubt present in the mind of the spectator who knew the myth, but, with his knowledge of what was unknown to the character in the play, his interest was kept alive mainly by such subtle reminders as made that knowledge poignant.

When a dramatist makes these re-

mindings,² he may be described as playing upon or emphasising 'the irony of the situation.' This he may often do with the help of scenic or musical effects. But the words which he puts into the mouth of his characters are usually the principal medium at his disposal, and it is convenient to employ the term 'dramatic irony' to signify language which provides a reminder to the audience by means of the ignorance of some character. The term should include all such language, not only in the mouth of the ignorant character himself, but also when spoken in his presence by an informed character. In a narrow sense, this is only a specialised form of those understatements³ which we call 'irony' in speech and non-dramatic writing. Thus instead of a simple contrast between the expression and the evidently designed meaning of the speaker or writer, we have in dramatic irony the more subtle contrast between the meaning which the dramatist wishes us to attribute to the speaker or listener on the stage (or both), and the further (usually more fundamental) meaning which he intends us to grasp as being his or belonging to his plot. But certain

¹ In his book on *Irony*, Professor J. A. K. Thomson remarks that 'a Greek tragedy is all ironical, and this is the vital difference between ancient and modern drama.' Few would challenge the general truth of this statement. But (a) in his remarks on Tragedy, he confines himself mainly to the irony of confidence; (b) he does not appear to discuss the important part which verbal irony plays in emphasising the irony of the whole.

² N.B.—The dramatic interest is maintained *not*, as is sometimes said, by the sense of superiority in knowledge, but by the emotions which arise from that knowledge—such as pity, fear, or a sense of fun.

³ The current use of the term to describe contrast between clearly designed meaning and expression is only an extension from the 'understatements' of Philodemus.

existing confusions of thought make it more necessary to point out how in the following essential particular ironic style of conversation and writing differs from dramatic irony. Where the first is found, it is not necessarily being used to convey any of what are often called the 'ironies' in life. The irony perceptible in much satire is by no means always employed with this effect. Similarly those writers, such as Thomas Hardy, who have been most conscious of ironies in existence do not necessarily employ irony in style. On the other hand, both in tragedy and comedy, dramatic irony is regularly employed to *emphasise* for the audience (by means of reminders) the irony of the situation, and so to suggest something of life's ironies. It is possibly unfortunate that since the seventeenth century phrases such as the 'Irony of Life' have been employed rather loosely and often without discrimination.¹ Yet the use of such terms is at the same time suggestive. They all imply a contrast between what is true and what is false, between aim and achievement, or between life as it really is and life as it appears at the moment. But as in the case of stylistic irony found in language, so in the case of these contrasts found in life, it is essential, if they are to be truly ironic, that they should be felt and noticed by someone with a detached attitude. Hence they are peculiarly adapted to stage representation. Now such was the character of Greek thought that the stories dramatised were themselves imbued with a sense of the ironies found in life. But various forms of dramatic irony (as defined above) were used to *emphasise* the varying ironic situations which were depicted. No exhaustive examination of them can be made here, but there follows a suggestion as to how this emphasis was secured in a few typical situations which must be carefully distinguished.

1. A simple variety occurs when we are informed spectators of some deception which is carried out by one man

upon another. This is common in life and in the comedy and tragedy of all ages. When we remember the Athenian love of trickery, it is not surprising that Greek tragedies are well stocked with these situations. Five out of the seven complete surviving plays of Sophocles contain such scenes, and they are no less frequent in Euripides. Now the successful dramatist knows that an audience must not be allowed merely to gape at the clever lies told by one man to another, but must be reminded of the situation and of the fact that they are lies. On the modern stage a wink or something equivalent from a good actor may sometimes suffice. No winks were possible where all actors were masked. Consequently the deceiver's words were made to wink, by means of language which, while conveying one thing to the deceived, was capable also of a very different interpretation. When young Neoptolemus begins his invented story, explaining to Philoctetes why he is on his way home from Troy, 'With difficulty,' he says, 'shall I tell this story.' His words suggest to Philoctetes,² 'It is hard for me to tell how badly I have been treated,' but the audience is by them reminded that this young man is to tell lies and that it is hard—against the grain—for him to do so. Later, when Neoptolemus has been more affected by the pathos of the situation of Philoctetes, he says: 'May the gods take us safely from this land to wheresoever we wish to sail.'³ Philoctetes, of course, thinks that he means 'to home'; the audience knows that he means 'to Troy.' The dramatic effect of the double-edged language in these and in many similar examples is partly to make us feel the full pathos involved in the situation of the deceived man, by reminding us that he is being deceived. But there is another influence at work. A fictitious story which contains verbal truth may satisfy to some extent the conscience of the speaker. At any rate, it will be far more effective on the stage than a story which contains no truth. That the Greeks were fascinated by

¹ When Fate is regarded as engineering or enjoying the contrasts in man's life, the phrase 'Irony of Destiny' is legitimate. It is questionable whether it is ever applicable altogether to Greek Tragedy.

² *Phil.* 329.

³ *Ibid.*, 528-9. Cf. 780-1 and C.R. XLII., p. 55.

ambiguous language of this sort is obvious from their oracles. But while such double-edged language appealed no doubt to the intellect of an Athenian audience, we should also realise that, as used on the tragic stage, it often made the deception more grim. 'Even with the verbal truth before him, he still does not understand!' Such is the conscious or unconscious sensation of informed hearers when a character is deceived by words which are really true, if he but knew how to interpret them. When Clytemnestra says to the elders in the presence of Agamemnon, 'I shall not blush to confess before you my amorous fondness: fear and diffidence fade from us all in time,'¹ it is horror rather than intellectual appreciation that the double-edged language produces, when we know Agamemnon to be hearing the truth and yet mishearing it. For her 'amorous fondness' is for Aegisthus, and her diffidence has indeed faded from her.²

2. (a) When we turn to the use of language which has a true significance of which the *speaker* is unaware (a use often described as 'Sophoclean Irony'), we find again that it does not merely pander to an audience's sense of superior knowledge, but that it makes more acute the emotion felt when watching the blindness of a character. This kind of irony often occurs in the same scenes of deception as the irony mentioned above, and with similar effect. It may also be found where the speaker's blindness is not assisted by a human deceiver, but is due to fate or to obstinacy. One might instance the well-known words of Oedipus, when he learns that the murderer of Laius must be tracked down. 'I'll drive this evil out,' he cries, 'since he that slew this king

might perchance, by the like hand, strike at me.' The audience shudders: for it is forcibly reminded of the mental blindness of Oedipus. Language, the full significance of which is not perceived by the speaker, was used by Sophocles (in a more masterly manner than by any other dramatist) to bring home to us the blindness of man.³

(b) When blindness takes the special form of confidence before a disaster which the audience knows is threatening, there occurs a well-known ironic situation, closely associated (as Mr. Thomson, following Mr. Cornford, has shown) with some of the most primitive feelings of mankind. Aeschylus made full use of it—in his plays confidence is often an active agent in hastening on the disaster—and Sophocles, using confidence to make the catastrophe more tragic, did not neglect the dramatic opportunities which such situations offered. His favourite device of the 'joyful chorus' preceding the disaster is but one of the methods which he used to emphasise the irony of confidence. When Philoctetes is rejoiced at the prospect of sailing home, he says impetuously: 'Tis ever fair sailing when thou fleest from evil.' He little knows the sort of sailing expedition on which he is destined to go, and how the supposed evil, which he believes confidently he is to escape, itself lies in that expedition. In those words and in many similar, he shows pathetic confidence in Neoptolemus. But the audience is made more fully conscious of the irony of that confidence by the further import which the language conveys. For in actual fact we know that Philoctetes is to have a 'fair sailing' to Troy, and thereby is to win glory for himself and escape from the evils which beset him on the island. This passage is here quoted as one of many instances in which Sophocles helps us by irony of language to feel the ironic situation engendered by confidence.⁴

¹ *Ag.* 856-7.

² Cf. e.g. *O.T.* 320, 329, 332, 1168; *El.* (*Soph.*) 606-7, 799, 1451, 1455; *Ajax* 99, 686, 690; *Phil.* 812, *Trach.* 315, 329 ff. etc. In scenes of conscious deception, language put into the mouth of the dissembler which gives the character to whom it is addressed the intended false impression, is ironic if it also reminds the audience of the truth. It may be language that is (a) true, but not true in the sense understood by the deceived, or (b) true in two senses, but only one of them is understood by him. The preference for (b) is noticeable in Sophocles.

³ Cf. e.g. *Trach.* 321 where Deianeira's 'ironic' interest in Iole is emphasised by the dramatic irony involved (*εὐφορία* double-meaning). Cf. also *Trach.* 85, 494; *El.* 773; *Antig.* 1051; *Phil.* 782, 907, etc. This use is however less distinctively Sophoclean than that described under (3) below.

⁴ Cf. e.g. *El.* 1456; *Trach.* 616-7; *Ajax* 96; *Ant.* 473-4, 760; *O.T.* 8, 244-5, 397, 626, etc.

(c) Far less frequent than the last mentioned variety is the situation sometimes employed by Sophocles when a character grieves over some lesser matter, while the audience knows that a greater disaster is soon to fall upon him. Philoctetes' grief at the death of the best Greeks no doubt, as Patin says, brings out the generous side of his character.¹ But it also helps the audience to feel the irony consisting in that more acute grief which the hero is to feel. Similarly there is irony in his distress at finding his reputation unknown to Neoptolemus.² This is the 'last straw,' he feels. He has been suffering a terrible wound and the long loneliness of the desert island, and from it he has not even won any glory! But he is unaware of a more cogent reason for bitterness which is to be his, though of this the audience is conscious, and is made the more so by his present outburst.³

3. In all the situations mentioned in the last three paragraphs, characters are ignorant of some 'Change of Fortune' which the audience knows must happen to them. It is important now to consider those further situations which lead to a 'Peripeteia' in the more specific sense in which Aristotle appears to use the term in *Poetics* XI. i.⁴—viz., 'a change by which a line of action intended to produce a certain effect produces the opposite.'⁵ For those who feel conscious that 'a war to end war' may itself be producing more wars, there is an even greater irony than for those who are spectators of other forms of blindness among men. The anticipation of such a 'Peripeteia' creates a situation used more (so far as our evidence shows) by Sophocles than by Aeschylus or Euripides. One may note

how, at the end of the *Electra* of Sophocles, the dead body of Clytemnestra is believed by Aegisthus to be that of Orestes; and how, by his very eagerness to gloat over the supposed corpse of the man he fears, Aegisthus falls into the trap set for him, and is brought to his destruction.⁶ In the play of Aeschylus, Aegisthus enters incredulous about the report of the death of Orestes, and he is filled with that uneasiness which often comes in the midst of hybris. Sophocles remembers this, but remembers also the gloating of Aegisthus over Agamemnon in the first play of the Aeschylean trilogy; and he has, in this way, created a grim scene. The dramatic irony of the language emphasises the grimness, and keeps the audience in horror-struck anticipation of the Peripeteia which is about to come. 'Take off the covering from the face,' he says, 'that kinship may receive the tribute of lament from me also.'⁷ For a moment Aegisthus is attempting by pious words to avert a possible danger that might come in his imagined triumph: but the language he uses itself brings nearer his own discovery of the real danger at hand, and of the identity of the kindred whom he is indeed to lament.⁸ In such cases, the words of the speaker are charged not merely with *more* meaning than that which he intends, but with a meaning known to lead to the *opposite* of his intentions. There is no need here to quote well-known examples from the *Oedipus Rex*, where by his very words a character is seen to be bringing about what he is striving to avoid.⁹ But it is

⁶ *El.* 1442 ff.; every word in the scene emphasises the irony of the whole.

⁷ *Ib.*, 1468.

⁸ To make the irony complete, Aegisthus is encouraged by Orestes to lift the veil himself.

⁹ Ironical situations preceding a Peripeteia were not of course confined to Sophocles. But (a) S. made the most extensive use of verbal emphasis of them; (b) the psychological variety was probably not found in Aeschylus (unless we are to count as such the desire to speak good omen, with the inevitable result that words of bad omen follow). As an example of verbal irony illustrating in Aeschylus the pre-Peripeteia situation, one may quote the famous prayer of Clyt. as Ag. goes into the palace. 'Zeus, Zeus, accomplisher! Grant now my prayers. Hereafter as thou wilt mayest thou

¹ *Phil.* 332 ff. (The irony is confirmed by N.'s comment in 339-40.)

² *Ibid.*, 254. (The irony of 258 assists the effect.)

³ Cf. the messenger's words in *O.T.* 937.

⁴ Elsewhere Aristotle used the term differently. But if the distinction is in itself important, it matters less how far A. felt it. Neither did he think it worth while to find a word for 'irony' in our sense, mainly, no doubt, because double-edged language was so natural to Greeks that no comment on its dramatic use seemed necessary.

⁵ Cf. Butcher, p. 323-4.

worth noticing that there is traceable in Sophocles a still more subtle use of that dramatic irony which leads to a *Peripeteia*. Sometimes the words used by a character may reveal a part of his mind which is hidden even from himself, or which he is consciously trying to suppress. Beneath the superficial meaning of his language—*i.e.*, beneath the meaning which he is supposed himself to be intending—the audience may feel a reminder that there is another side to his mind, and that because of this he will eventually carry out the opposite of what he now intends. It may be even that the very vehemence with which expression is given to his present intentions itself causes the eventual victory of the opposite line of action. But whether or not such a *Peripeteia* of 'suppression' is discernible in Sophoclean drama, it can surely not be denied that a use of dramatic irony, when it reminds the audience of an undercurrent or hidden characteristic in the speaker's mind, may sometimes emphasise for us the ironic fact that in spite of his present beliefs or intentions (and even partly because of them) he will carry out the opposite. When Neoptolemus is speaking of Odysseus to Philoctetes, he says: 'He is a clever wrestler, but even clever schemes are often tripped up.'¹ The audience is reminded of the emphasis placed early in the play on the dislike of guile felt by the son of Achilles: we know that this scheme, too, is to be tripped up by the generous feelings of the young man himself. Even while he is seeking to deceive Philoctetes (and it is quite clear that he has not yet relaxed in his intention to carry out the plot), his words bring us a reminder of his dislike of the scheme, and suggest how that dislike will cause its failure in spite of all his present efforts. If this interpretation is felt to be forced, the young man's words in ll. 456-8 and ll. 671-3 should be compared.² In these passages, by means of dramatic irony, the audi-

dispose.' We know that this prayer by its accomplishment is to turn against her. Zeus will indeed dispose as he wills. Compare the effect of Clytemnestra's prayer in *S. El.* 644 ff.

¹ *Phil.* 431.

² These passages were discussed in *C.R.* XLII, p. 55.

ence is given a clearer glimpse of N.'s own underlying estimation of the very act which he is seeking to perform; and it is thus that we are reminded of the psychological reasons which are to cause the failure of that act. When it is known that Polybus is dead, Iocasta reaches the height of impiety. Oracles are worthless, Luck governs all. Yet Sophocles, I believe, allows the audience even at this moment to see what can only be described as an instinct of which she is not conscious. 'Banish these thoughts for ever from thy soul,' she says to Oedipus, consciously meaning, 'Think no longer on these oracles';³ but the language can also imply, 'Seek not to probe this matter further, for even now it will not bear examination.' In spite of her rash confidence, the audience is for a moment reminded of her instinctive fear of what Oedipus' probing may yet produce. The undercurrent in her mind appears. It is not because they have a right to be confident, but rather because they have a right to dread the truth, that she and Oedipus should turn from oracles. The opposite of her present conscious fearlessness is thus revealed—though it is not articulately expressed until she knows all, but seeks desperately to keep it from Oedipus.⁴

I have here attempted to sketch briefly a few of the uses made by Greek dramatists (and especially by Sophocles) of language which reminds the audience of knowledge by means of the ignorance of a stage-character. Ironical situations arising from blindness, and from the specialised forms of blindness—confidence, minor grief, and the situation that leads to a *Peripeteia*—each of these has been seen to be emphasised by dramatic irony, while a further more psychological use of this verbal device

³ *O.T.* 975.

⁴ If, as I believe, Mr. Sheppard is right in his interpretation of the *Electra* of Sophocles, then one might compare with this sort of irony the words of E. to A. (1457): 'Thou mayest rejoice, if this be cause for joy.' Beneath the obvious irony of the words lies an expression of the undercurrent in E.'s mind—disgust at the work that the conspirators have to do. Comparable also are the words of Deianeira in *Trach.* 582-7. Even in her stupid confidence she has misgivings (revealed by the ironic implications of ll. 583 and 586).

has been suggested. All such discussions must suffer from appearing to lay too much stress on the intellectual appeal made to an audience. But the

appreciation of irony is mainly emotional, and is closely associated with 'pity and fear.'

S. K. JOHNSON.

THE PRIORITY OF THE MERCATOR.

In a recent article in the *Classical Review* (XXXIX. 3, p. 55) Mr. W. B. Sedgwick has developed the theory that the proportion of lyrics in Plautus' plays gives us a clue as to their relative date. It is certainly remarkable that our few certain dates support the proposition—in itself a reasonable one—that Plautus developed the lyrical element as his command over language and metre grew. Mr. Sedgwick's striking table gives first place to the *Asinaria* and the *Mercator*. The priority of the *Mercator* had already been urged on general literary grounds by Westaway (*The Original Element in Plautus*, pp. 2-4), and P. J. Enk ('De Mercatore Plautina,' *Mnem.* Vol. 53) has recorded his view (cf. p. 58) that the *Mercator* stands apart from the other plays as being an almost *uerbum de uerbo* rendering of its original. It is therefore particularly interesting that in these two plays the name of the author appears as *Maccus* (*As.* II) or *Titus Maccus* or *Maccius* (*Merc.* 10), whereas elsewhere it is always the familiar *Plautus*. Owing to the occurrence of this form *Maccus* in the *Asinaria*, and also because of the supposed allusion in line 124, the play has been ascribed (cf. Michaut, *Plaute*, Vol. I., p. 86) to as early a date as 212. (Michaut's table shows some interesting resemblances to Mr. Sedgwick's.) But the argument from the proper name holds good for the *Mercator* also.

The absence of Roman colouring in the *Mercator* is particularly noteworthy in the opening scene. Here if anywhere we might expect to find that appeal to the audience which is so manifest in the other opening scenes—whether they are 'prologues' proper or not. As a matter of fact, Charinus' monologue, besides being verbose and dull, contains nothing which might not be ascribed to Philemon. (Compare, in particular, lines 4-5 with Kock *Frag.* 79, and lines 31-2 with Kock *Frag.* 97; also note the Greek references in lines 40, 61, 67, 75, 87, 91.) It

is difficult to believe that such an opening scene could grip the attention of the Roman audience. (Contrast the brief, humorous, and direct prologue of the *Asinaria*.) There are good things in the *Mercator*, but they come too late.

We are not entitled to regard a play as early merely because of literary inferiority. But it seems in the highest degree unlikely that Plautus, having developed his peculiar style, with its constant alliterations, puns, and topical allusions, and his mastery of the lyric, should return to the stage of mere translation (with occasional aberrations). Yet this is what we should have to believe, if we accepted the conclusion of Marx ('Ein Stück unabhängiger Poesie des Plautus,' *Sitz. der Kais. Akad. der Wissensch.* CXL Band, Abh. 8) that the *Mercator* is subsequent to, and in part copied from, the *Rudens*. His main thesis (pp. 17 ff.) is that the Dream-scene in the *Rudens* is in perfect harmony with its context, while that in the *Mercator* is not, and thereby displays the clumsy hand of the Latin dramatist, imitating where he had once translated, and making a mess of it. Enk, in the article already referred to (pp. 64-68) has vindicated the *Mercator* Dream-scene as appropriate to its setting and agreeing with the subsequent development of the play. We may carry the argument further. The Dream-scene in the *Rudens* is itself unsatisfactory in several respects. Some of these have been pointed out by Leo (*Pl. Forsch.*, p. 163). Here are a few more. The dream should, of course, foreshadow events; but we find that in some important particulars it positively contradicts them. In Daemones' dream an ape tries to climb up to a swallow's nest, and failing to reach it, approaches Daemones with a request for the loan of a ladder (ll. 598-602). Daemones pleads for the swallows, whereupon the ape, growing angry, threatens to have

the law on the old man, who then resorts to mere physical violence (ll. 602-610). How badly all this squares with the subsequent events! Labrax does not appeal to Daemones for aid; on the contrary, Daemones has him dragged out of the temple forthwith. Labrax shows no desire to plead his case in court; he says that he will have nothing to do with the local law. Finally he is

dragged off to court *in spite of* his struggles (ll. 660, 724-5, 881).

In view of these considerations, there appears to be no cogent reason for regarding the Dream-scene of the *Mercator* as modelled on that of the *Rudens*. We are, therefore, left free to assign to the *Mercator* that priority in date to which the evidence already cited entitles it.

W. BEARE.

LUCRETIVS V. 1341-9.

Si fuit ut facerent : sed vix adducor ut ante
non quierint animo praesentire atque videre
quam commune malum fieret foedumque futu-
rum ;

et magis id possis factum contendere in omni
in variis mundis varia ratione creatis
quam certo atque uno terrarum quolibet orbi.
sed facere id non tam vincendi spe voluerunt
quam dare quod gement hostes, ipsique perire,
qui numero diffidebant armisque vacabant.

LUCRETIVS V. 1341-9.

A SUGGESTION of Professor Housman is worthy of examination. He proposes¹ to condemn lines 1341-3 and 1347-9 above as not the work of Lucretius, to recognise them as the work of Marcus Cicero, and to find in them support for the belief that the latter edited the poem. 1344-6 have, he contends, been inserted here from some other point in the poem.

Of 'the rational misgiving expressed in 1341-3' he says, 'That he should have taken the trouble to dress it in verse and should then have set it over against his confident and circumstantial fiction, as if he were two persons instead of one, is not seriously credible.' Should one be confident that it is altogether a fiction?² But even if

Lucretius is giving a groundless belief of his own, is it not seriously credible that, having set out to unfold his thoughts at length in verse, he should, after saying 'Men have tried to take bulls, bears, and lions with them into battle but with no good result. They saw with disappointment the animals which they thought they had tamed become wild and indiscriminately destructive when wounded and confused by battle,' continue '— if indeed they did (*sc.* take and see with disappointment, etc.). But I am hardly to be persuaded that they could not anticipate the disastrous consequence for themselves as for the enemy. That this has happened (*sc.* the taking with this too hopeful thought and its disappointment) might better be asserted for the whole universe with all its diverse worlds than for one world in particular. No, men chose to do this not so much in any hope of victory as from a wish to make the enemy suffer while they themselves perished. They were men without hope in numbers and without arms' (*i.e.* desperate)? I have brought out the implicit force of *cernebant* (1335). Here is the crucial point. If we had to choose between them, it is to this, the immediately preceding statement, and not the remote *temptarunt* (1308), that usage and sense alike would require that *facerent* in 1341 and *id . . . factum* in 1344 should be referred, but it is better to understand these more generally of the whole, the action thus qualified, thus interpreted, the taking of beasts into battle with mistaken thoughts which they disappoint. Then in 1347, when that qualification, that interpretation, has been eliminated, the poet can with *non tam vincendi spe voluer-*

¹ *Classical Review*, XLI., 1928, pp. 122 f.

² Among such uncivilised races there are practices of which the poet may have heard, though the commentaries are silent. I distinctly recall, but unfortunately cannot at the moment trace, a description of how a tribe drove their cattle before them against the enemy ranks (compare the evidence quoted by Postgate in 'New Light upon Lucretius,' *Bulletin of the Rylands Library*, Vol. X., No. 1, January, 1926, p. 7 f.). Desire for the strength and impetuosity of bulls, boars, etc., seems to lie behind their use as emblems, and sometimes, doubtless, as living mascots of warriors or armies. Such symbolical acts as the launching of a 'white-footed' goat (or ram) against the enemy (see *Kausika sutra* XIV., 22) might easily be magnified.

unt, etc., if not very elegantly yet without ambiguity, use *facere id* of the simple action, the taking of beasts into battle. Munro, whom Professor Housman cites for rejection of the lines, appears to have referred *facere* also to this last, missing the point. Of 1341-3 he says '*Si fuit ut facerent* is obviously a comment on *sed facere id non tam cet.*' (1347 ff.), which latter he accepts, but Professor Housman himself answers, '1347-9 cohere with 1341-3. It is not satisfactory to strike out 1341-6 and let 1347 follow on 1340.' Munro continues: 'Lachmann to make sense and grammar is compelled to read *Sic fuit* with Mar. Ald. 1 Junt. Lamb. for *Si fuit*, and to transpose 1342 and 1343,' which falls to the ground simply because Lachmann's changes are unnecessary.

Professor Housman's attack upon 1344-6 runs: 'They are not, as Lachmann will have it, a derisive comment, even from a reader less intelligent than Cicero; as such, they are too completely pointless and too openly untrue. It is less incredible that men trained bulls and boars and lions for battle in one world, where those four animals are at least known to exist, than in other worlds, where they are not.' But this scepticism about the contents of other worlds is irrelevant, since it belongs to Professor Housman and not to Lucretius, for whom this world with its adjuncts has rough parallels *numero innumerali* (II. 1086).

necesse est confiteare
esse alios aliis terrarum in partibus orbis
et varias hominum gentis et saecula ferarum.¹
(II. 1074 ff.)

and, in any case, what is in one world is in the inclusive sum of worlds, to which and not to 'other worlds' Lucretius is opposing it. In that sum of worlds the latitude of things credible is greater, not less, than in one of its members. Those worlds are not all exact replicas of this, and in one or more of them, where conditions between men and beasts are slightly different, beasts may be employed with such expectations and disappoint them. Lucretius, having painted a picture, hesitates to rule such version

out altogether. It may yet have a place in reality. His interest in possibilities of warfare and its history is largely 'theoretical,' and what may happen in that sum of worlds, whose system is his theme, matters for him. Discussing the problem presented by the movement of our particular heavens, he suggests various explanations:

nam quid in hoc mundo sit eorum ponere certum
difficile est; sed quid possit fiatque per omne
in variis mundis varia ratione creatis
id doceo plurisque sequor disponere causas . . .
(V. 526 ff.)

Lachmann, whom Munro follows in rejecting 1344-6, understood *id . . . factum* of the mere taking of such beasts into battle and missed the point, so that his argument is worthless. The diction, as Professor Housman says, 'is thoroughly Lucretian.' The suggestion that they have been inserted here from another part of the poem is unsupported by any better alternative placing or any reason for the transference. Their acceptance establishes also 1341-4 and almost necessitates that 1347-9 or some such positive opinion should follow.

Against 1347-9 Professor Housman urges that 'whereas the author of these lines says that the men *armis vacabant*, Lucretius at 1311 had credited them with *doctoribus armatis*.' The barbarous folk of which Lucretius appears to be speaking, having captured and tamed a few wild animals, take them into battle as their main strength. It is surely not unnatural that the trainers controlling these should be equipped with such weapons as are available, while the rest have to meet the enemy with nothing worthy to be called armour as against that of troops like those of Rome.

There remain the reasons for thinking that Cicero, rather than Lucretius, wrote 1341-3 and 1347-9. Such use of *adducor ut* occurs only this once in the text of the poet but twice in that of Cicero, *De Fin.* I. 14 and IV. 55, while no instances have been collected from elsewhere. Such cogency as this argument might possess is diminished by the remembrance that in addition to the *De Finibus* we have about twenty times as much of Cicero as of Lucretius. The periphrasis *fuit ut*, as Professor Housman notes, 'common in Lucretius, is

¹ Cf. Epicurus Πρὸς Ἡρόδοτον, § 74 (Usener, pp. 26 and 380; and Bailey, pp. 46 f. and 245).

rare in Cicero, but it occurs at *de div.* I. 128.¹ To the pleonasm *ante praesentive* he produces four parallels from Cicero. How natural the idiom was to Lucretius may be recalled from the famous 'It ver et Venus et Veneris praenuntius ante. . . . Flora quibus mater praespargens ante vias' (*V.* 737-9). 'These verses, too, contain something which is not Lucretian and which is Ciceronian. In Cicero *vacare* with the ablative, in the sense of lacking, is frequent: Lucretius never constructs *vacare* or *vacuus* with any case and never uses either except in the literal signification of emptiness.' A glance at Paulson's Index will show numbers of expressions throughout the poem which, occurring once there and more often in Cicero, 'are not Lucretian and are Ciceronian.' The use with the ablative is at least as old as Ennius (see Macrobius VI. 2. 26) and that a poet, whose chief occasion for the verb must obviously be in the absolute sense to express his doctrine of 'the void,' should use it four times¹ thus absolutely and once with the ablative is not remarkable.

Finally, if Cicero were editor, is it probable that he would either foist into the text lines of his own or, as Professor Housman prefers, jot down in a manuscript entrusted to him for publication a bantering comment in the same metre and in such a position that it could be published in the text, and, having done so, carelessly let it go forward?

¹ I have not included one, possibly two, instances of the participle *vacans* as a substantive, meaning 'void.'

Brief marginal comments upon a work already published may be provoked under strong feeling without thought of a reader. Comment of such form and length must have had a reader in view, and, unless we imagine that he showed it to his friends, there was none but himself and the copyist. In any case, was the point of sufficient interest to Cicero, and is the jest sufficiently obvious? Is not the passage rather but one of many instances of that Lucretian 'earnestness,' whose conscientious exploring of possible doubts and alternative explanations it is sometimes difficult to enjoy in equal seriousness? I suggest that Lucretius, beginning with the bare fact received that men had tried to use such beasts in battle, with vivid imagination conceives the scene in detail—what would happen?—the wild beasts charging this way and that out of hand, those who had brought them stricken with consternation, themselves victims; and he writes as he sees. But then he reflects that this must have been foreseen. Men might have been such fools, or beasts different, in another of the worlds of that whole system which is his theme, but in this one men must have known. To court death thus, they must have been desperate. Lucretius is a poet and a philosopher. He has seen the battle and is not ashamed to have taken thought of the conditions and motives behind, involving a slight correction of his picture, a moment afterwards. The truth, being found, must be told.

R. B. ONIANS.

TACITUS, ANNALS IV. 12.

AN INTERPRETATION AND A CORRECTION.

ATQUE haec callidis criminatōribus, inter quos delegerat Iulium Postumum, per adulterium Mutillae Priscæ inter intimos aviae et consiliis suis peridoneum, quia Prisca in animo Augustae valida anum suapte natura potentiae anxiam insociabilem nurui efficiebat.

'These things (Sejanus did) by means of cunning accusers, among whom he had chosen Postumus, who was intimate with (Agrippina's) grandmother and

especially qualified to help him, because Prisca having great influence over Augusta . . . estranged the old lady from her daughter-in-law (Agrippina).'

The objection, of course, to this version is that the Empress is 'loosely called' Agrippina's grandmother. Nipperdey declared this to be impossible; and whether or not we may conceive that Tacitus might 'loosely' call Augusta Agrippina's grandmother, it is

surely inconceivable that he should do that here, when, in the very same sentence, he presently refers to them, correctly according to his usage of terms of relationship, as mother-in-law and daughter-in-law (*nurus*). Nipperdey cut the knot by removing *inter intimos aviae* et from the text.

Furneaux, however, proposed to make *haec*, as nom. fem., subject of *efficiebat*, and to refer *haec* to Livia, so that *aviae* should mean 'Livia's grandmother'; and he put a comma after *valida* (sc. *erat*). This disposes of the difficulty of the relationships. But the rendering is clearly inadmissible, because Tacitus is certainly describing the machinations, not of Livia, but of Sejanus. We must therefore acquiesce in the usual rendering.

But several difficulties besides the one that has been noticed are involved in the words *inter intimos aviae*. (1) It is impossible to conceive that Postumus should have gained intimacy with the Empress *per adulterium Priscæ*. Anyone who reflects for a moment on Augusta's character and on the treatment of *adulterium* when detected in high society under Augustus and Tiberius must feel the impossibility. We may take it for granted that the Empress was unaware of the guilty relations of her friend Prisca with Postumus. (2) Even if we could conceive that *adulterium* was a passport to Augusta's favour, how would an intimacy between Postumus and Augusta have helped Sejanus? Sejanus wanted Postumus, who had no influence with Augusta, to 'get at' Prisca, who had great influence with her. In his *Sejanus* (Act II., sc. 3) Ben Jonson, as a good dramatist, naturally ignores the statement that Postumus was himself closely acquainted with the Empress:

Julius, I would have you go instantly
Unto the palace of the great Augusta,
And by your kindest friend, get swift access;

and again:

Noble Postumus,
Commend me to your Prisca: and pray her,
She will solicit this great business,
With all her utmost credit with Augusta.

(3) It is evident that the first reference that Tacitus made to the Empress in

this passage was at the word *Augustae*. To imagine that he referred to her already by the indirect *aviae* is to me impossible. He would have written *Augustae* in place of *aviae*, and *aviae*—if he wrote it at all—in place of *Augustae*.

It is very tempting, therefore, to cut out *inter intimos aviae* et. But how are we to account for its insertion in the text? How could anyone have been moved to add such an idiotic comment? The real trouble is in the word *aviae*, and in *aviae* only. What Tacitus wrote is *inter intimos Liviae*. Postumus, like Eudemus, was specially useful because he was intimate with Livia, the wife of Drusus; and he was intimate with her because he was himself a member of the adulterous coterie to which she belonged. It may be thought that Livia might have gone to Prisca herself. No: Sejanus knew, none better, that the proper person to get at Prisca was Prisca's paramour.

In addition to the reasons that I have already given, it is recorded by Tacitus that Prisca's husband, Fufius Geminius, himself enjoyed the high favour of the Empress (V. 2). Is it likely that his rival, Postumus, also enjoyed her intimacy—and precisely because he *was* his rival in his wife's affections? We do not know the nature of the charge that caused Prisca to commit suicide in A.D. 31, just after her husband's death (Dio, LV. 4). But it is evident from Dio's narrative that she was somehow involved in the charges brought against her husband by Tiberius. Sejanus was not in a position to denounce her in 31 for her intrigue with Postumus, of which Tiberius knew no more than the Empress had known.

Mr. E. Harrison has pointed out to me that Ritter long ago conjectured that *Liviae* should be read in this sentence. It is strange that a conjecture, for which there is so much to be said, is not so much as mentioned in English books; and strange that it has not been received into the text by any German editor.

Mr. Harrison also draws my attention to Joh. Müller's conjecture *aulae* for *aviae*. This is attractive, and of course it meets some of the points that I have

raised. But *aulae* would necessarily include the Empress here; and I claim that Postumus had no influence with her. If so, *aulae* cannot be right.

In the 1st *Medicean* 'a et u saepis-

sime permutantur' (Rostagno, *Cod. Laur.*, etc., p. ix): and though I can find no other example, *li* is a very easy substitute for *u*.

E. C. MARCHANT.

HORACE, *Ep.* I. 6, 5-8.

Quid censes munera terrae?
quid maris extremos Arabas ditantis et Indos?
ludicra. Quid plausus et amici dona Quiritis?
quo spectanda modo, quo sensu credis et ore?

THIS, the punctuation of Keller, is the least unsatisfactory of the numerous varieties proposed. For a criticism of these punctuations and interpretations one may refer to Wilkins' edition. Besides Keller's punctuation, the following suggestions have a *prima facie* possibility.

(a) *ludicra* quid? plausus et amici dona
Quiritis
quo spectanda modo, quo sensu credis
et ore?

This requires us to interpret *ludicra* as (public) 'games,' a use of the plural hard to parallel, and apparently studiously avoided. When Justin (*Epit.* VII. 2. 14) uses the plural, he is clearly referring to the various events in an Olympic contest; Alexander, he says, competed *vario ludicrorum genere*; Wilkins, following Mewes, refers to Madvig on Cic. *Fin.* I. 20. 69, *ludicra exercendi aut venandi*. But there (if the reading be correct) *ludicra* means 'pastimes,' not 'public games.'

(b) *ludicra* quid plausus et amici dona Quiritis?

Plausus is here gen. sing. depending on *ludicra*. The main objection to this proposal is that, in saying *ludicra plausus*, Horace would be prejudging the question.

With Keller's punctuation *ludicra* is the reply of Numicius. Wilkins remarks on the abruptness of this, and points out that it would naturally imply a similar answer after *quo sensu credis et ore?*

These difficulties are removed if we read:

Quid censes munera terrae?
quid maris extremos Arabas ditantis et Indos?
ludicra? quid plausus et amici dona Quiritis?

'What is your opinion of wealth? A bagatelle, you think? Yes, but how do you react to the temptations of political ambition?'

The formula by which Horace asks a question, and interrogatively foreshadows an answer, may be observed in *Ep.* I. 4. 1-5 and I. 11. 1-4.

W. S. MAGUINNESS.

CHARITO I. 3, 5.

ἀπορομένου δὲ αὐτοῦ καὶ τρέμοντος ἡ γυνὴ μηδὲν ὑπονοῦσα τῶν γεγονότων ἰκέτευεν εἰπεῖν τὴν αἰτίαν τοῦ * *

All editors leave a gap after τοῦ, but the MS. has χάλου.

R. M. RATTENBURY.

REVIEWS

THE MISSION OF GREECE.

The Mission of Greece: Some Greek Views of Life in the Roman World. Edited by R. W. LIVINGSTONE, Vice-Chancellor of the Queen's University, Belfast. Pp. xii + 302; 8 photographs. Oxford: University Press (London: Milford), 1928. 7s. 6d.

MR. LIVINGSTONE is so accomplished a scholar that it is almost superfluous to review this book from the professional point of view. It is a sequel to *The Pageant of Greece*, beginning with Epicurus and ending with Lucian, who thus gets a second innings, which nobody is likely to begrudge him. Its object is to 'convey some notion of the chief ideals which ruled men's minds in the years from 300 B.C. to 200 A.D.'; and this it does with the important exception that

it leaves Christian writers on one side. The practical reasons for this are obvious, at least as far as the New Testament is concerned; but inasmuch as the Epicureans, the Cynics, and the Stoics are well represented and the life of Apollonius of Tyana is included, there would have been good reasons for bringing Philo and Justin Martyr and Clement of Alexandria, for example, to the notice of the readers for whom the book is principally intended. If it were argued that it was not till after 200 A.D. that either Neo-Platonism or Christianity had established a claim to be included among the 'chief ideals,' the answer would be that their pretensions had more vitality than the decadent ideals of Polemon and Herodes

Atticus. And in spite of the eloquence of the Dean of St. Paul's the popular notion of Christianity is still far from realising the share which Greek thought had in the composition and propagation of its philosophy.

Mr. Livingstone's method is to give, with introductions and a running commentary, substantial extracts translated from Epicurus, Epictetus, Marcus Aurelius, Dion Chrysostom (both on his own account and as recording traditions of the early Cynics), Plutarch, Maximus Tyrius, the *Lives* by Philostratus of Apollonius of Tyana, of Polemon and of Herodes Atticus, Aelius Aristides, and Lucian. The translations of Epicurus, Dion, Maximus, Aelius, and of two of the *Lives* are Mr. Livingstone's own; those of the rest are from the well-known Oxford Translations. All are as perfect as the best scholarship and most highly trained taste can make them. Mr. Livingstone appends the epithet 'brilliant' to Mr. Jackson's *Marcus Aurelius*, the late Professor Phillimore's *Philostratus*, and Messrs. Fowler's *Lucian*; but the difference in merit between Mr. Jackson's *Marcus* and Mr. Matheson's *Epictetus* or between Phillimore's *Philostratus* and Mr. Livingstone's own would be exceedingly difficult to establish in a court of literary critics; and if Professor Tucker and Mr. Prickard read less brilliantly than Messrs. Fowler the difference is fully accounted for by the contrast between the styles of Plutarch and Lucian.

The extracts are excellently chosen and full of interest of many sorts; but no doubt for every person who reads them with any persistence there will be many who will read what their editor has to say about them. The running commentary is lively, pointed and pithy, 'full of wise saws and modern instances'—and indeed Mr. Livingstone has something of the judicial air which is proper to a Vice-Chancellor together with a touch of scorn for the *Zeitgeist* in common with the Cynics. He devotes one of his rare footnotes to the very sophistical proof that agnosticism is 'an intellectual absurdity, because each human action implies unconsciously a

theory of life, on which the agnostic is *ex hypothesi* unable to make up his mind'! He has a very poor opinion of modern philosophers and seems to regard their intervention in practical affairs as almost inconceivable. Yet a Haldane or a Balfour, a Smuts or a Masaryk, has surely as good a title to the name of philosopher as any of those who were, as Mr. Livingstone says, 'retained, like chaplains, in the service of rich Romans.' And if Dion Chrysostom could harangue mutinous troops on the duty of discipline, Professor Masaryk did very much more remarkable things with soldiers in the throes of the Russian revolution. Masaryk may be said, in fact, to be the first embodiment, on a great stage, of Plato's conception of the philosopher-king, with the possible exception of Marcus Aurelius. But in Marcus the philosopher and the king were much less perfectly fused in one. I confess that it seems plain to me that philosophy has an increasing effect upon the conduct of civilised man and that in this lies our only hope of turning material progress to the real benefit of mankind. But *The Classical Review* can scarcely be asked to afford room for such a discussion.

Minute points which Mr. Livingstone might consider for a future edition are as follows. The word 'commence' occurs twice on p. 3 and once on pp. 9 and 214 and 'commencement' once on p. 4, where 'begin' and 'beginning' would surely be better. 'Destined' on pp. 4 and 5 might give way to 'intended' or 'designed.' It is not quite clear why Epicurus is said to deal 'not quite candidly' with pain (p. 21). He may not be 'convincing' on the subject: but is anyone? To say (p. 76) of an 'emotional and rather priggish' letter that it is 'a schoolgirl's letter rather than a schoolboy's' seems, as far as my experience goes, to be employing an obsolete distinction. On p. 107, ll. 7, 8 from bottom, I think 'former' and 'latter' should be transposed; and perhaps the contrast would have been clearer if St. Martin's-in-the-Fields and the City Temple had been substituted for Westminster Abbey and St. Paul's.

NOWELL SMITH.

RAMSAY'S ASIANIC ELEMENTS.

Asianic Elements in Greek Civilisation.

By SIR W. M. RAMSAY. Pp. 303.

London: John Murray, 1927. 12s. net.

A GREAT scholar writes for us on his own terms, and twelve shillings' worth of Sir William Ramsay is always good value. It would therefore be captious to complain that the title of this volume does not describe the bulk of its contents; that the proofs have not been corrected; that there is little documentation, and no index to guide the reader through an unusually disparate miscellany of topics. The general thesis is the sound one that he who would understand Greek literature and civilisation must again and again seek his clues in Anatolia; and Sir William Ramsay maintains his thesis triumphantly, in spite of the handicap he imposes on himself by too often forgetting 'Anatolia' and substituting 'etymological speculation based on the glosses of Hesychius.' Let it be said that there is much in this volume of the stimulating and thought-provoking comment which we have grown accustomed to expect from its author. Its weakness lies in a tendency to preach a sometimes rather startling Anatolian *Weltanschauung* with scant regard to our just and reasonable claims on chapter and verse, and a somewhat cavalier treatment of much of the evidence actually vouchsafed. We do not forget, in criticising these idiosyncrasies, that we are dealing with a pioneer who has blazed many a memorable trail where now the road is familiar and well-laid. But inference from ascertained fact to what lies fairly and squarely ahead of it is a different thing from such unanchored speculation as that on p. 54 ff., or from that impatience with the recalcitrance of evidence which leads to falls like the following. On p. 99 we find an inscription based on a hand-copy which bears many traces of the haste to catch a train which is alleged in its defence. It is the epitaph of Menandros, a Christian presbyter, surmounted by a monogrammatic cross; and it would probably be dated by nine out of ten epigraphists about A.D. 375-425. The two final lines are addressed

by Menandros to his surviving wife, and run:

εὐχολὰς δὲ Θεῷ ἀποτινύ[ω ὧ]ς κέ σε θάσσον
ρύσῃ' ἐξ α[.]λων καὶ μοι κ[αλόν] οὄνομα λ[ε]ίπῃς.

In the last line it naturally occurred to Sir William that ἀχέων might be read, making Menandros pray (unless, indeed, we restore ἀποτινύ[ε], for the release of his wife ἐξ ἀχέων. But no, this was too commonplace; the bolder restoration is always right; let us, then, restore ἀ[θ]έων, remembering that οἱ ἄθεοι was almost a *terminus technicus* with third and fourth-century Christians in speaking of their persecutors. The inscription, therefore, belongs to the great persecution, and is to be dated *ca.* A.D. 300.

And so Christian Epigraphy was enriched by a new memorial of the persecutions, and embarrassed by an occurrence of the monogrammatic cross some decades earlier than it can be proved for any region of the Roman world. This gossamer structure (with much else in the 'Anatolian' interpretation of this hard-whipped epitaph) crumbled at the touch of evidence. The stone was rediscovered in 1928, and the reading, clear and certain, is ἀχέων.

I refer to this minor episode only because it illustrates a method applied freely throughout the volume, but not always so easy to control. The longest and one of the best chapters is devoted to 'Hipponax on Lydian Scenes and Society.' It contains much that is fresh and suggestive, and that only Sir William Ramsay could have told us; but when, for example, we find Tzetzes' τοῖόνδε τι δάφνας κατέχων transmuted (with the aid of Homer and Hesychius) into τεγοῦνα, χειρὶ δάφνας ἔχων 'Ἀπόλλωνος, our thoughts stray to Menandros the presbyter. Hesychius, indeed, gives only τεγοῦν· Λυδοὶ τὸν ληστήν: the word τεγοῦνα is the child of metrical necessity. And if you ask its inventor for proof or evidence that such a word ever passed a Lydian lip, he has his answer ready in the Preface: "Much that is here said is unproved."

Such reasoning, from such a pen, is unexpected. When, on the other hand, Sir William Ramsay forgets Hesy-

chius and draws (as in the first part of the chapter on 'The Vultures at Troy,' and elsewhere in this volume) on the vast stores of solid knowledge he has accumulated on practically every aspect of Anatolian life, ancient and modern,

we are the gainers and his humble debtors. And, *mashallah*, he can write; no reader should miss his thumbnail sketch of the genesis and essence of Hellenism on pp. 20 f.

W. M. CALDER.

GREEK MYTHOLOGY.

A Handbook of Greek Mythology, including its Extension to Rome. By H. J. ROSE, M.A. Pp. ix + 363. London: Methuen and Co., 1928. 16s.

THIS book fills a real gap. No compendious handbook of Greek mythology which takes any account of the results of recent scholarship previously existed in English. I do not know of any book on the subject in any language which contains as much information in so small a compass. It is well arranged. While the novice will find the main text intelligible, the expert, however learned he may be, is likely to find in the notes something he has missed or does not know. Common sense is as marked a feature of the work as its learning, and if *obiter dicta* upon theorists both ancient and modern are sometimes a little violently expressed, they are substantially just. The book is well printed, and the number of proper names which

have eluded the proof-reader's care is surprisingly small.

Gratitude is importunate. When the time comes for a second edition I venture to hope that the additional note to Chapter I. might be expanded. It would be useful, to the general reader particularly, to have a short summary of how the literary tradition affected mythology, and a summary of its various stages—Homer; post-Homeric epic; the genealogists, particularly Pherekydes and Hellanikos; Attic drama, particularly Euripides; the Attidographers; Alexandrian interests and literary tastes. Much of the story is implicit in Professor Rose's account, but it would be worth setting out for those who do not know it. I am glad to see that Professor Rose stresses an often neglected point—the degree to which the literary skill of Ovid or the literary exigencies of what he was trying to do have reshaped mythology.

W. R. HALLIDAY.

THE HIPPIAS MAJOR.

The Hippias Major, attributed to Plato.

With Introductory Essay and Commentary by DOROTHY TARRANT, M.A. Pp. lxxxiv + 104. Cambridge: University Press, 1928. 12s. 6d. net.

THIS edition of a curious little offshoot of the Platonic Academy is an interesting and useful achievement, not merely as a learned and discerning guide to the meaning of the *Hippias Major* itself, but also because of the excellent survey which its Introduction gives of Plato's earlier metaphysical theory. The Introduction is arranged in seven sections: the first discusses the authorship of the dialogue, which it places later than the *Gorgias*, *Republic* and *Phaedo*, and earlier than the *Parmenides*, *Theaetetus* and *Philebus*, and

ascribes to a young student of the Academy in Plato's own time. The second section provides an able summary of all the reliable information about Hippias of Elis, and gives this pompous, yet picturesque and respectable, pedant due credit for his serious accomplishments. After a brief comparison of the two *Hippias* dialogues, Section IV. (in 28 pages) traces the development of Plato's earlier theory of Ideas, taking the important dialogues in the following order: *Euthyphro*, *Protagoras*, *Euthydemus*, *Gorgias*, *Meno*, *Phaedrus*, *Symposium*, *Cratylus*, *Republic*, *Phaedo*. The exposition is throughout admirable for its lucidity and freshness: perhaps hardly enough justice is done to the 'protreptic' fervour of the *Gorgias*,

and its eloquent glorification of the philosophical life, in considering whether that dialogue, rather than the *Phaedrus*, should be regarded as Plato's manifesto for the opening of the Academy. Emphasis is rightly laid on the signs in the language of the *Phaedrus* which probably betray a definite experience of Plato at the Mysteries. Section V. discusses the metaphysical theory and language of the *Hippias Major*; VI. gives a brief account of the theory of Pleasure in Plato's own works and in this dialogue, and shows how the latter's distinction of an 'aesthetic' pleasure helps to place it later than the *Gorgias* and earlier

than the *Philebus*. Section VII. offers an interesting analysis of the style and vocabulary of the dialogue, clearly marking the several peculiarities which separate the writer from Plato.

The text is that of Burnet in the Oxford series. The notes (58 pages to 29 of text) are thoroughly well instructed, and show good sense in weighing alternative interpretations, careful attention to details of idiom, and constant respect for relevance. A bibliography and two indexes complete a highly commendable work of research and exegesis.

W. R. M. LAMB.

THE LOEB ISOCRATES.

Isocrates. With an English translation by GEORGE NORLIN, Ph.D., LL.D. (The Loeb Classical Library, No. 209.) Pp. li + 411. London: William Heinemann, Ltd.; New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1928. Cloth 10s.; leather 12s. 6d.

THE appearance, in the Loeb series, of the first volume of Isocrates is particularly welcome because no complete English translation of this author is available, and the rendering of the first ten orations by J. H. Freese is now very difficult to obtain. The present volume contains discourses I. to VI. in the canonical, not Drerup's, order. The Greek text is that of the Zürich editors, not that of Blass; occasional divergences from Baiter-Sauppe are indicated at the foot of the Greek pages. The translation is on the whole excellent. It is a well-known fact that Isocrates, while he is one of the clearest of Greek prose writers, is nevertheless one of the hardest to render into idiomatic English. This is mainly due to the elaborate periodic structure which is characteristic of most of his discourses, but which cannot be reproduced in translation without some sacrifice of style. Mr. Norlin is to be congratulated on his success in keeping the mean between the extremes of adhering too closely to the sequence of Isocrates' sentences and frankly making no attempt to keep the periods of the original.

The reader is provided with a good

deal of guidance apart from the translation. Each discourse is preceded by an explanatory note setting forth the circumstances under which Isocrates wrote it. There is a general introduction of some length, in which the editor tells clearly the main facts of his author's life, and offers a number of lucid observations on the various aspects of his work and teaching. One or two points seem to call for criticism. Starting from the well-known passage in the *Phaedrus* (279 A), Mr. Norlin strives to show that Socrates' influence on Isocrates was very considerable. Yet the supposed proofs which he adduces from Isocrates' works are illusory, since the views there expressed are not peculiar to him and to the philosopher. On the other hand, the whole trend of Socratic teaching had an aim radically different from the Isocratean *φιλοσοφία*. Again, the greatness of Isocrates as an educator is hardly stressed enough, although it is in the field of education that his influence was most profound and most enduring.

The editor's brief notes to elucidate historical and other allusions in the text are uneven in quality. Some are very helpful, others are misleading, as they stand, or inaccurate. Thus we read (p. 378, note a):

In the memorable Sicilian expedition of 414 B.C., Gylippus defeated the Athenian general Nicias and took his entire forces captive.

Surely this is an inexcusable abbreviation of the facts. A reference (p. 176, n. a) to Herodotus' figures for Xerxes' host is useless to the reader, unless he is also warned that they are impossible. The note *b* on p. 396 implies that Massilia was founded in 524. The *Epitaphius* of Gorgias was not published some time after 347 (p. 163); but this, and Conon, instead of Cimon, as victor of the Eurymedon (p. 193, n. *h*), are doubtless printer's errors: the date for the destruction of Mantinea, 383 instead of 385, is not, as the following note

shows (p. 198, n. *b*); while the blockade of Phlius began in 381 and lasted till 379. Thibron, not Thimbron, is the correct spelling, and is actually so printed in the Greek text. The elder Cyrus' accession, though its exact date is in dispute, cannot on any calculation be put as early as 559 (p. 360, n. *a*).

The existence of such blemishes as these must not, however, blind us to the fact that the book as a whole is an admirable piece of work. It is much to be hoped that the second and third volumes will appear at an early date.

M. L. W. LAISTNER.

THE NEW TEUBNER ΑΘΗΝΑΙΩΝ ΠΟΛΙΤΕΙΑ.

Aristoteles, Ἀθηναίων Πολιτεία. Post FR. BLASS et TH. THALHEIM edidit HANS OPPERMAN. Pp. xv + 128. Leipzig: Teubner, 1928. One plate. Paper, M. 2.80; cloth, M. 3.60.

So active is Germany that this is the seventh edition of the *Constitution* issued by Teubner (besides the two school editions of Hude). All are more elaborate than Kenyon's Oxford text, and this is the most elaborate of all, and remarkable value for the price. The preface contains the usual description of the papyrus and its writers, but omits Thalheim's discussion of the value of the corrections (in his apparatus Herr Oppermann follows Th. in being content with 'm. 2,' where Kenyon is more precise). The bibliography is brought up to date, though it remains unclassified—a serious matter when nearly 200 items are listed; and to some, for example to Hommel's important article on the dicasteries, no titles are given. (In this it is stated that Hude's second edition, of 1916, was of cc. 1-41 only, which is not so.) Th. had only one index, Oppermann has three, and his *index rerum* is very full. He also has a plate with illustrations of all four hands.

His apparatus is even more elaborate than Thalheim's, and consists of three sections: (a) References to modern writers for the elucidation of particular passages; (b) *Testimonia*—not only quotations direct and indirect, but also 'talia, quae, quamvis ab Aristotele aliena essent, ad textum interpretandum aliquis momenti esse putabam' (mostly

omitted by Th.); and (c) critical, following Th. closely. But this endeavour to put in a small book all the information given in a large edition like Sandys's fails, and gives a false impression of completeness. There is, for example, to c. 10 a reference to Hill, Gardner, and Seltman, and a summary of Hill's interpretation (with no hint that Seltman differs); but on c. 4. 2 (τούτους δ' ἔδει διεγγυᾶν, κτλ.) no reference to any article, no record of emendations, and no interpretations offered (not even as much as Th. gave, 'τούτους pro obiecto accipiendum, cf. Hermes XXIX. 460'); and more general references, such as 'c. 63 f., Colin, *Rev. Ét. gr.*, 1917, 20,' have already been given in the bibliography. Inconsistencies of this kind are numerous, and the whole section might have been spared if the bibliography had been classified. Similarly in (b): it is useful, of course, to have references to Thucydides in the chapters on the Four Hundred, but the net is very widely spread, so that we have on 16. 10 (the law concerning tyrants) references to Andocides I. 97 and *Thesmoph.* 338, and even, on 8. 4 πόλιν, 'cf. Thuc. II. 15. 6'; yet on 17. 1 reference is made to *Politics* V. 1315b 29 (so Th.), but not to Hdt. V. 65; nor on 3. 6 and 4. 1 to *Pol.* IV. 1298a 28 and II. 1274b 15, both of which Wentzel quoted. (In this elaboration of apparatus 'cf. Aristid. II. 360 Ddf.,' at the end of c. 12, has got out of place.)

The critical apparatus is intended apparently to be complete; at least, the

most trifling spelling mistakes are given. Yet it is not: 35. 1 'Πυραιῶς L, ε super ai adscr. m. 2, 37. 1 ὅσοι 'οσσοι L, 41. 2 Μηδικά 'μιδιχα L, η corr. m. ?, κ superscr. m. 2' (just as Thalheim); but 37. 1 ηετιῶνια τιχος (corr. m. 2) and 41. 2 υπεδιξεν are not noted (as they were not by Th.), though they are in Kenyon and are quite visible on the papyrus.

In the text the following points may be noted:

3. 3. ἀντὶ τῶν δοθεισῶν . . . δωρεῶν: ἀντί has had a varied life; it is restored to the text by Oppermann.

4. 2-4. The square brackets of Th. now rightly omitted. (So in 7. 3, καθάπερ διήρητο καὶ πρότερον, and 41. 2, μετὰ δὲ ταύτην ἢ ἐπὶ Δ., κτλ.)

6. 1. καὶ νόμους ἔθηκε: 'del. W.-K., prob. Th., qui cft. c. 7. 1, sed cf. p. 14. 3.' This is unintelligible, for p. 14. 3 is the line of Solon (as O. reads) κράτει | νόμον βίην τε καὶ δίκην συναρμόσας. Still, on p. 14. 3 he, as pleased as before, refers back to 6. 1. (O. rightly notes the fact—omitted by Th.—that Plutarch, who has ὁμοῦ, quotes this line by itself.)

12. 4. Like Th., O. omits Aristides' v.l. χρησμὸν λέγοντας.

13. 1-2 (the years after Solon's archonship). O. keeps the MS. readings, as Th. did, but his dates (given in the margin) are different and wrong (Th. was right). For διὰ τῶν αὐτῶν χρόνων he compares Isocr. VI. 27 (not Pol. III. 1275a 23, as Blass), which is a pertinent reference only if a third interval of four years is understood. He gives 588-7 as the year of the first anarchy, and keeps the MS. δευτέρῳ in 14. 1 (as did Th.), though recording the conjecture τετάρτῳ; yet (5. 2) he puts Solon's archonship in 594, not in 592. And he gives no references to Cichorius or Schröder for the correct, nor to Lehmann-Haupt (*Klio* VI. 312. 1), Willmowitz, or Beloch (*I.* 2², p. 163) for the incorrect view. Nor is he consistent in his treatment of the MS. figures—no editors are; for though they keep δευτέρῳ here and τετάρτῳ in 22. 8, merely recording corrections, they agree in 34. 1 to correct ἐβδόμῳ to ἑκτῳ.

15. 4. Th.'s conjecture was καὶ [χρόνον μὲν ἡκκλησί]ασεν (O. omits μὲν in

recording it); O. reads, with Kenyon, καὶ [χρόνον προσηγό]ρευεν, which has the advantage of tense.

21. 5. οὐ γὰρ ἅπαντες ὑπῆρχον ἐν τοῖς τόποις: so O., as Th. (except that the former omits Papageorgios' emendation ἔτι ἐν τ. τ., wrongly, and Bury's ἅπασιν ὑπῆρχ' ὀνόματα, rightly); but ἔτι, which Kenyon with reason says is the papyrus reading, is essential, unless Ar. is repeating himself from the last sentence.

22. 5. The conjecture πεντακοσίο-μεδίωνων (recorded by Th.) should not have been omitted.

22. 7. τὴν δαπάνην secl. H.-L., Th.. O. rightly removes the brackets.

24. 3. Th. had Blass's τοὺς φρουροὺς ἄγουσαι τοὺς . . . ἀνδρας, which cannot be right. O. keeps φόρους and marks a lacuna, as W.-K., which is safer.

31. 3. O., like Th., keeps Sandys's ὅταν αὐτοῖς γένηται; but τοῖς ἀστοῖς, the MS. reading, makes as good sense and should be kept. In either case we should surely read γένηται.

41. 1. Th. obelised δοκούντος, with a critical note 'lacunam ind. W.-K.,' and a conj. <καταλυθέντες>, δοκούντες δὲ δικαίως τότε ἀναλαβεῖν, κτλ. O. rightly marks a lacuna in the text, but Th.'s unsatisfactory conjecture is all that he records. The lacuna should be filled either, as Kaibel suggested (though his reasoning was not all of it sound), by some such sentence as ἐπὶ Π. μ. ᾧ. <τοὺς πρώτους δύο μῆνας, τοὺς δ' ἐπιλοίπους δέκα Εὐκλείδου . . . καταστάντος εἰς ἀρχὴν>, or perhaps ἐπὶ Π. μ. ᾧ. <νικήσαντες μάχῃ, ἐπὶ δ' Εὐκλείδου τὰς διαλύσεις ποιησάμενοι>. The genitive δοκούντος might then be retained (with τὸν δῆμον of course bracketed).

49. 1. ἀλλ' ἀνάγουσι: O. rightly returns to this from Th.'s ἀναβαλίνουσι (with his naive note 'centurionem equidem noram, qui equo suo ideo cotidie sacharum praebebat'). It is characteristic of Kenyon's Oxford edition that he has no critical note here.

54. 7. O. follows Th., and leaves an unsatisfactory text.

63. 2. ἐνδεκάτου, τοῦ λ [[τριακοστοῦ]]: the Germans again have the advantage of us—Kenyon (Berlin edition) made a slight error in giving the original reading of the MS.; in his Oxford edition his only note is 'τριακοστοῦ' manifestus

error interpretantis litteram λ'; Sandys is no better. Both Th. and O. have correct notes.

In cc. 63-69 O. adopts many of Hommel's conjectures and records them all; this makes a notable advance on Th.

On column 33 he repeats Th.'s very useful note as to the position of the fragments in the plates of the Facsimile.

Fragm. 5 init.: like Th., O. adopts Blass's view that τὸ τῶν Ἀθ. πλῆθος here refers to the plebs only, and will not insert εὐπατρίδας καί. In view of the following sentence, concerning the four *phylai*, the *phratritai*, *trittyes*, and *gene*—among them the Eumolpidai, Kerykes, and Eteoboutadai—this can hardly be right.

A. W. GOMME.

PSYCHOLOGY ANCIENT AND MODERN.

Psychology Ancient and Modern. (Our Debt to Greece and Rome.) By G. S. BRETT, M.A. Pp. ix + 164. London, Bombay, Calcutta, Sydney: G. G. Harrap and Co., Ltd. 5s. net. MR. BRETT's lively and useful, if not always too accurate, sketch is divided into five chapters dealing in order with general psychology (mainly sensation and cognition), psychology of conduct, applied psychology, Hellenistic thought, the Greek tradition. On Chapter I I have just two criticisms to make. It is surely misleading to suggest that Greek psychology is dominated 'from Empedocles to Galen' (p. 24) by the doctrine of πνεῦμα σύμφυτον as the explanation of life and the 'agent in sensation' (p. 40). This obscures the important point that there are in the main two conflicting types of theory, that which finds the principle of sensation and awareness generally in τὸ θερμόν and that which finds it in 'the air in the brain.' I think Professor Brett far too ready to read back into an earlier time ideas which, as comes out incidentally later on, he really knows to be those of Stoics and physicians of the Alexandrian period. Also, in view of the great historical influence of Aristotle's conceptions, I think it unfortunate that as good as nothing should be said, in dealing with his account of cognition, about νοῦς and the vast problem of the *intellectus agens* and *intellectus possibilis*, or of the meaning of the doctrine of 'sensible species.' 'Space will not permit' (p. 50) is hardly an adequate apology. On the other hand, Chapters 2-4 seem to me better done. They will give the reader a very fair understanding of the theory of conation assumed in the *Ethics* and the general presup-

positions of Platonic and Aristotelian educational and social doctrine, with a reasonable amount of information, not always very well arranged, about Hellenistic developments. But it is odd to be told (p. 40) that Aristotle regards a sensation as a 'mode of motion which takes place in the pneuma,' and odder to find εὐγένεια, *generice*, rendered 'well-being' (p. 78). The speech of Alcibiades in Plato's *Symposium* does not precede that of Socrates (p. 100) but follows it, for reasons directly connected with the logical and artistic plan of the dialogue. I do not know what to make (p. 115) of the statement that the famous doctrine of temperaments was originated by 'a man called Polybus,' and was a feature of the medicine of the Sicilian school. Mr. Brett must know that Polybus was a nephew of Hippocrates, and that the scheme of the temperaments which became classic was directly founded on the 'humoral pathology' of the school of Cos. And did the 'later Middle Ages'—whatever period is meant—really hold (p. 147) that all men are 'endowed at birth' with a knowledge of the Decalogue?

I am disappointed in the last chapter. It contains many interesting remarks about the persistence of Greek psychological ideas down the ages, but is too scrappy and confused to throw much light on the history of the transmission of the Greek tradition as a whole. It also suffers badly from insufficient indications of dates. Why A.D. 430 (the sixth year of Valentinian III, and the year of the death of Augustine) is said to be the time when 'the Roman Empire came to an end' (p. 139) I cannot guess. From the sentences which immediately follow, a reader not already

acquainted with the history would naturally suppose that this alleged disappearance of the Roman Empire was roughly synonymous with the rule of the Abbasid Caliphs in Bagdad (not founded until the middle of the eighth century) and the great outburst of Arabic translations of Greek philosophy and medicine (which belongs to the ninth). No doubt

these apparent implications are due to mere haste of composition, but I could wish that Mr. Brett had been more careful. He might have made his little book one of the best of the series in which it appears; at present it can hardly be said to be that, though it is very much better than some of the others.

A. E. TAYLOR.

LYSIPPOS.

Lysippos. By FRANKLIN P. JOHNSON, Ph.D. Pp. xii + 334; 61 plates. Duke University Press, Durham, N. Carolina, 1927. \$7.50.

THE study of Greek sculpture has passed through various phases during the past century. The earlier generation of scholars were content to map out in a general way the chief periods and styles, to correlate them with the literary evidence, and to illustrate them by a certain number of typical sculptures. More recent writers have attempted to fill in this outline by the classification and identification of the vast mass of sculpture that fills our museums, usually in relation to some period or even to some individual master. Dr. Johnson's study of Lysippus is an example of such work. It offers a thorough and painstaking collection of everything that can throw light on Lysippus and the products of his art, whether in ancient writers, in extant works of sculpture, or in the numerous contributions, discussions, and identifications made by modern students. This has necessarily involved a great amount of highly contentious matter; in dealing with it, the author has for the most part given careful statement of opposing views, with fairness and impartiality. But he has also in certain cases shown the courage of his opinions; for instance, when he sees 'a tinge of effeminacy' in the Apoxyomenos.

One naturally turns first to see how he deals with the difficult problem of the Apoxyomenos and the Agias. His judgment here is affected by the fact that he does not like the Agias. He even makes the somewhat fantastic suggestion that 'when Alexander saw'

the Agias at Delphi 'he felt sorry for Daochos, who was a friend and partisan of Macedon, and asked Lysippos to make a good statue to be set up at Pharsalos.' The author gives a list of those who have discussed the question of the Apoxyomenos and the Agias. The majority seem to be in favour of regarding both as Lysippean: of those who accept the one and reject the other, the greater number are advocates of the Apoxyomenos. It would be interesting to know what their opinions would have been, if the discovery of the Agias had preceded the identification of the Apoxyomenos. Dr. Johnson quotes Wolters' view that the evidence of the inscriptions, with the additional number of victories at Pharsalus, shows that the Delphi statue was the first to be erected, and therefore had no connexion with Lysippus. But this seems in no way convincing. Few of those who have studied the question seem to realise the great difference between a contemporary marble replica and a Graeco-Roman copy.

Lysippus was a most prolific sculptor; and one is not therefore surprised to find that a great number of extant statues have been attributed to him upon more or less satisfactory evidence. In addition to recorded works, Dr. Johnson says, 'by comparative study alone, three, and only three works can be ascribed to him with certainty.' And, of these three, one is the Meleager, which is more generally, since Gräff's article, associated with Scopas. This example suffices to show the difficulties of the subject. It would be impossible to discuss all the identifications and attributions referred to without a review as long as the book itself. Many are

generally accepted; others are at least probable; but there remain many which rest upon slender evidence or are matters of acute controversy. Even in the introductory study of earlier artists there are some doubtful statements. For example, the standing discobolus here attributed to Naucydes is by many considered to be an Attic work. Nor is Dr. Johnson much more successful than his predecessors in his attempt to realise the work of the somewhat shadowy Euphranor.

The volume concludes with sixty plates, many of them of statues not too

familiar; and these are a welcome help to the reader. The references to modern writers are remarkably full, and the collection of passages from ancient authors concerning Lysippus is half as long again as that in Overbeck's *Schriftquellen*. There is perhaps no sculptor of equal distinction as to whom so little is known for certain; and therefore all scholars will be grateful to Dr. Johnson for having collected together, so carefully and so completely, all the material that is available for the study of his work.

ERNEST A. GARDNER.

GREEK TRADE.

Emporos: Data on Trade and Trader in Greek Literature from Homer to Aristotle. By H. KNORRINGA. Pp. 144. Amsterdam: H. J. Paris, 1926.

THIS book will serve a useful purpose in recalling in a convenient and accessible form the main literary sources for the study of the Greek commerce of this period. As is inevitable, the chapters on the writers of the later fifth and of the fourth century, since these authors contain in themselves practically the whole of the available information on the subject, are by far the best part of the book. In spite of certain omissions—some mention of Attic mines and stone quarries, for example, might have been included in the section on the treatise *Περὶ Προσόδων*—and the strange misinterpretation of the Hermippus fragment quoted by Athenaeus as a list of commodities brought into Athens by 'a certain ναύκληρος Dionysus,' these chapters should be of great assistance to the student. The reader in search of specialised information must, however, be prepared to read through the whole book to find it, since the Herodotean method employed by the author tends to a certain confusion which could only be compensated by a far more complete index than the book contains, including

at least mention of metics, trade-routes, ancient ships, and the staple articles of commerce.

The two chapters on Homer and Hesiod, and in a lesser degree those on the early lyric poets and Herodotus, are somewhat thin, and suffer from omissions which are bound to occur if we dissociate certain passages from the archaeological evidence: so for example some consideration might have been given to the source of the whole narrative of *Odyssey* IX.-XII., and Herod. I. 163 (Phocaeans in the Adriatic), V. 88 (VIIth-century embargo on Attic pottery at Argos and Aegina), VII. 158 (limitations of trade with the West at the time of the Persian wars), and IV. 152 (a detailed description of Argive bronze bowls), are conspicuous and typical omissions. Similarly, neglect of later authorities has tended to obscure the importance of other passages, and Naucratis, for example, is dismissed in a single inadequate paragraph. The author might also have revised his opinion of VIIth-century Sparta, had he not omitted Alcman from the sources considered in Chapter III.

The book suffers, like many translations, from numerous misprints and strange spellings.

K. M. T. CHRIMES.

BUCK'S GREEK DIALECTS.

Introduction to the Study of the Greek Dialects. Grammar, Selected Inscriptions, Glossary. Revised edition. By CARL DARLING BUCK. Pp. xviii + 347. Dialect map of Greece and 4 charts of dialectal peculiarities. New York and London: Ginn and Company, 1928. 35s. net.

It is a pleasure to welcome a second edition of Professor Buck's book on the Greek dialects—a model of lucidity and accuracy. The first sight of the revised edition made one fear that the scope and perhaps the plan of the book had been entirely altered, for it is about twice the bulk of the original work; but that fear was soon set at rest. The new edition is, in fact, in large measure printed from the same plates, with the addition of some 28 pages. The increased size is due chiefly to the use of a much thicker paper and wider margins. It is thus, one supposes, that the publishers justify the almost trebling of the cost. A Canadian Professor tells me that across the water 'books are sold by the inch.' In print as well as in paper the new edition compares badly with its predecessor, but this is the only unfavourable criticism that one has to make. The whole work has been very thoroughly revised. Without altering the paging or the numbering of the sections in the body of the work Professor Buck has made a large number of small changes necessitated by the new material that has come to light since 1909; in not a few cases passages are rewritten and paragraphs judiciously pruned in order to admit additional matter.

In the first edition Professor Buck pointed out the secondary importance of the dialectal evidence from the literary remains, and it was one of the many merits of his book that he did not allow this evidence to distort for the student the picture which the inscriptions give. In the new edition he compiles a very useful summary of the characteristics of some of the literary dialects, but rightly relegates it to the Notes and References. These Notes and References are, perhaps, for the serious student the most important

part of the book, though many will turn first to the added pages containing a selection of the new Arcadian Inscriptions and the Argive draft of the fifth-century treaty between Cnossos and Tylissos. Most interesting of all is the new boustrophedon Locrian bronze (published in 1926), with its numerous breaches of the ordinary Locrian dialect spelling, its interesting forms like *μείστον* 'at least' and *πρέγα* (= *γερονσία*), and its new words. Professor Buck prints this text in the Notes and References, accompanied by a translation which he rightly terms tentative.

Professor Buck is not carried away by each latest wind of German theory. His discussion of vexed points is everywhere characterised by sober judgment, and on page after page his good sense appears. One might cite, out of dozens of instances, his rejection of the explanation of *-νθι* for *-ντι* in the active 3rd plural (*έντι* → *ένθι*), § 139; his note on Heracleian future—*οντι* (where *-ιοντι* is expected), § 141; his remark on Cretan optative *φέρξιαν* ('if not merely an error for *-αιεν*'), § 152; his adoption of Fränkel's theory of *-σις* forms in Argolis and rejection of Bechtel's explanation, § 164; his treatment of the fluctuation of *h* and *σ* for intervocalic *σ* in Laconia and Argolis, §§ 59 and 275. And one welcomes the note (p. 316) on the prevailing denial that genitive *ου* is of the same origin as *-οιο*, 'possibly true, but the objection to common origin is not conclusive.'

In the text of the selected inscriptions a few changes have been made. Attention may be drawn to two. In the much-discussed Labyadae rock inscription (No. 49, p. 205) Professor Buck accepts the readings of Bourget,¹ but in the Notes and References (p. 321) he has doubts, and rightly characterises Bourget's interpretation of *TON . . . ἀρχοντο* (*Τὸ ἐν . . . ἀρχοντο* 'commençaient l'examen de l'affaire Thrasymachos-Kamiroi') as desperate. In No. 50, the fifth-century inscription from the wall connected with the

¹ *B.C.H.* (1925) XLIX.

Delphian stadium, Professor Buck printed in the first edition τὸν Φοῖνον μὲ φάρην ἐς τὸ [E]ὐδρόμουν, noting that for ἐς τὸ we should expect ἐν τὸ in this dialect, and remarking: 'Eudromos, though otherwise unknown, was probably a sort of guardian hero of athletics. Hence the introduction of wine.' He now prints ἐς τοῦ δρόμου (= ἐκ τοῦ δρόμου)—a decided modification of the Prohibition Law!

It should be noted in conclusion that the glossary has been considerably enlarged, and that there is a useful addition in the Notes and References (pp. 302-305) of three or four pages on the alphabet. The selection of variant forms on p. 305 might be slightly enlarged, and the drawing and printing improved. The remarkably few misprints of the first edition have, I think, all been corrected.

S. G. CAMPBELL.

ANCIENT NOVELS.

Die Griechisch-Orientalische Romanliteratur in religionsgeschichtlicher Beleuchtung. By KARL KERÉNYI. Pp. xvi + 275. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1927.

THIS is an immensely learned and very interesting book, but it is seriously marred by the author's lack of balance and common sense. Almost every point that he makes is ingenious, but he often piles conjecture upon conjecture with indefatigable zest till Pelion, Ossa, and Olympus crash from sheer absurdity a stone's throw from heaven. The book is so packed with matter that it is difficult to carry the arguments in one's head, even with the help of the full summary of contents and the concluding 'historical survey': there are nearly twelve hundred footnotes, many of which fill twenty or thirty lines of small print, while some run to over seventy.

Kerényi's main thesis is that all ancient novels are derived from Egyptian religious stories of the superhuman adventures and sufferings of Isis, Osiris, and Typhon. He is undoubtedly right in emphasising the non-literary element in ancient prose fiction. The novel clearly arose in the Hellenistic age in response to a popular demand, and it never won recognition as a reputable form of literary composition: probably not even to the limited extent that Kerényi (following Thiele) claims in the first chapter, which deals with the slight and doubtful evidence wrung from the Auctor ad Herennium, Cicero, and Nicolaus. It is also true that in most of the novels the hero and heroine are under the protection of particular deities, and that there runs through

many of them an unmistakable strain of religious propaganda. Kerényi aduces many interesting parallels between the novels and pagan and early Christian 'aretalogical' stories of wonder-workers and saints, and this part of the book contains much that is new and valuable. It seems likely, however, that most of the phenomena can be explained by the existence of the popular element, combined with a literary tradition which goes back to the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*: it is hardly necessary to conclude that all these types must be based on stories of the Egyptian gods.

Kerényi does quote a few passages, especially in Antonius Diogenes, which suggest acquaintance with native Egyptian fiction, but much of his evidence is absolutely valueless. A long list could be drawn up of laughably slender arguments. In Longus I. 11, 12, Daphnis falls into a wolf-trap and gets muddy, *χάματος δὲ καὶ πηλοῦ ἐπέπαστο καὶ τὰς κόμας καὶ τὸ ἄλλο σῶμα*. We are asked to believe (p. 141) that both this 'burial' and the smearing with mud are of religious significance, and connected with the mysteries. Again, in connexion with the ass-story (of which more in a moment), Kerényi points out (p. 170) that in Xenophon of Ephesus II. 8. 2 Habrocomes dreams that he has been turned into a stallion: he is pursuing a mare, and at last catches her and turns back into human form. Kerényi guesses that we have here traces of a romance of Egyptian origin, in which the hero was a stallion and the heroine a mare, and he supports this conjecture by pointing out that Achilles Tatius' heroine was called Leucippe,

that his hero's father was called Hippias, that the hero himself, though his name was Clitophon, was ἵππειον σφόδρα γεγυμνασμένος, and that in Xenophon himself there is a character called Hippothous who possesses a horse. The fact that Apuleius' hero, while in ass form, has an intelligible weakness for trespassing in vegetable gardens is brought into connexion with Juvenal's *porrum et caepe nefas violare*, and we have a long note (p. 185, n. 38) on religious plants and their violation by animals.

It would be tiresome to accumulate such aberrations, but a few wider criticisms must be made. Throughout the book Kerényi wholly underestimates the rhetorical element in the language of the novelists. It is dangerous to enumerate passages in which heroes and heroines are compared to gods and goddesses, or even mistaken for them, and to argue that this suggests that they were originally divine beings: the rhetorical device, as Kerényi admits, is as old as Homer, and runs all through Greek and Roman literature. Nor perhaps is there much more force in certain other recurring motives of the Greek romance, on which he lays the greatest emphasis: the supposed death and unexpected reappearance of hero and heroine, and their frequent narrow escapes from torture and crucifixion. The novelists wrote for superficially cultured readers, who took little interest in psychology, and blood-curdling perils were the only possible means of keeping their interest. Kerényi is always ready to seek for an Egyptian illustration when a Greek parallel lies to hand. For the persecution of a pregnant woman he quotes the flight of Isis from Typhon without a word of Leto (p. 218).

The ass-story of the *ὄνος* and Apuleius plays a surprisingly large part in Kerényi's scheme. Derived from Egyptian propaganda stories of Isis and Horus persecuting Seth-Typhon in the form of an ass, it was raised from the Hellenistic underworld into literature proper, or rather improper, by Aristides of the *Milesiaca* in the second century B.C. This version had a ludicrous end, possibly that preserved in the *ὄνος*: it was translated by Sisenna

in 67 B.C. Influenced by the intensive Isis-propaganda of the beginning of the Christian era, Lucius of Patrae, in the first century A.D., rescued the story from its low surroundings and reclaimed it for Egyptian propaganda: to him we owe all the distinctive features of Apuleius' *Metamorphoses*, including Cupid and Psyche and the Eleventh Book. Lucius' version of this story had a decisive influence on a hypothetical second stage of Xenophon of Ephesus (what we possess is a third stage): the hypothetical first stage of Xenophon was an 'Isis-romance' independent of Aristides.

There is no space to follow this bold reconstruction further: it must be enough to point out that so much of Kerényi's evidence comes from the latest novelists that he is compelled to assume perpetual fresh recourse from first to last to strictly Oriental sources. With regard to the ass-story it is important to observe that Reitzenstein's clever attempt to prove that it was in the *Milesiaca* rests on the thinnest possible evidence: in truth solely upon the phrase 'ut cum penitus utero suo recepit' in a fragment of Sisenna. Kerényi, who quotes it without comment with the emendation 'totum,' devotes a long footnote (p. 162, n. 33) to an attempt to advance still farther in Reitzenstein's footsteps, a purely Laputan exercise.

Kerényi reasonably lays stress on the rôle played by Egypt in most of the novels, but he fails to observe that this Egypt is never the old independent Egypt, but almost always Egypt under Persian rule, and he overlooks the fact that most of the romantic novels are deliberately laid in the days of Greek independence, after the Persian wars, but before the Macedonian or Roman conquest. He altogether fails to stress the contrast between the contemporary background of Apuleius and Petronius and the vague antiquity preferred by most of the romancers.

A short review of such a book as this is almost inevitably unfair. Kerényi's work contains many interesting observations on the novels, and brings into view many neglected fields of ancient life and literature. He may prove to have

opened up a valuable approach to the study of the origins of the novel, but the first task of his followers will be to

clear from the path the intricate tangle of his more extravagant hypotheses.

D. S. ROBERTSON.

CLASSICAL BIOGRAPHY.

Epochs of Greek and Roman Biography.

By D. R. STUART. Pp. ix + 270.
Berkeley: University of California Press, 1928. 16s. 6d.

THIS book consists of a series of essays whose main object is to show (1) that Greek biography had its beginnings before the fourth century; (2) that Xenophon no less than Isocrates contributed to the establishment of biography as a distinct branch of literature; (3) that among the Peripatetic biographers the importance of Aristoxenus has been exaggerated; (4) that Roman biography was not based on Greek models, but developed organically out of the 'laudationes,' which contained all the germs of the full-blown literary species. In this group of theses the first and the last will probably attract the most attention. Neither is capable of formal proof, but

both have this point in their favour, that two such sturdy plants as Greek and Roman biography might be expected to have strong roots in their native soil. In particular, Professor Stuart is successful in showing, though the fact need never have been obscured, that individualism in Greek literature was not the product of a sudden metamorphosis which befel the Greek mind about 400 B.C., but was implicit in an apostolic succession of authors from Homer downward. Professor Stuart writes in a laboured Emersonian style, which makes heavy going for the reader. But those who can put up with intellectual jactitation (as Professor Stuart might have expressed himself) will probably appreciate the points of view to which they are led.

M. CARY.

A NEW LATIN GRAMMAR.

Stolz-Schmalz: *Lateinische Grammatik.*

In fünfter Auflage völlig neu bearbeitet von MANU LEUMANN und JOH. BAPT. HOFMANN. (Hb. d. Altertumswissenschaft, ii. 2). Part I., 1926. Part II., 1928. Pp. xxii + 924. Munich: C. H. Beck. Bound, £2 8s.

ALTHOUGH the names of the original authors still appear on the title-page, the fifth edition of the *Lateinische Grammatik* is, largely in plan and entirely in detail, a new work. The chapter on Latin Lexicography has disappeared to make room for a much fuller treatment of the Syntax by Hofmann, and for an excellent sketch, by the same author, of the development and present position of the study of the Latin language. The section of the Grammar devoted to 'Stilistic' occupies only some sixty pages, and might very well have been omitted altogether. The subject has an interest of its own, but one that does not intimately concern the linguist. What distinguishes this edition from

its predecessors, however, is, above all, its more extended scope. Both the authors use the material supplied by the non-Latin dialects and the inscriptions; and in the Syntax the language of Plautus and Terence on the one hand, and that of the late Latin writers on the other, are treated very fully.

Leumann's Phonology and Morphology is on the whole conservative. Thus he adheres to the doctrine of the 'long sonant'—e.g. *latus* is explained by **l̥t̥os*, although the objections to it on phonetic grounds have never been satisfactorily disposed of, while the theory of disyllabic roots offers an explanation of the facts which is phonetically simpler. He also passes over in silence the attempt to reduce the series of Idg. gutturals to two. On the other hand, in dealing with the question of the character of the Latin accent, he appears to incline to the view hitherto held almost exclusively by French scholars. The question is, perhaps,

more complicated than earlier German philologists realised, but the arguments against the theory that the Latin accent was tonic seem to me still to be unanswerable. Change in quality of vowels and syncope, which are characteristic of Latin, occur in other languages which have a marked stress accent; and they do not occur in languages which, like Greek and Sanskrit, are known to have had a tonic accent. The 'intensité initiale' of the French school is (unless it is another name for an initial stress accent) an otherwise unknown factor, and would not in any case account (as the assumption of a stress accent during the historical period does account) for words of the form *Apollinis*. P. 32. The assumed history of *nē, ne* requires modification in view of *Ir. nā*. P. 47. Leumann holds that the Latin alphabet must have had originally the symbol Z, but the assumption is unnecessary if the alphabet was fixed before the unvoicing of intervocalic s, and if one symbol could, as it does in many other languages, serve to represent both the voiced and unvoiced sounds. P. 101. *Putā* is a well-known exception to the rule that Imperatives of this form have -ā. P. 234. A clear example of an adjective in -bilis with active meaning is *penetrabilis* in *p. frigus*. P. 232. *Sōl* is explained as **sāvol*, but in *Māvors, māvolo*, the result of the contraction, is different. P. 264. The statement that the -ō of words like *lēno, ratio, homo*, was for the most part shortened, is not true for the classical period. P. 270. It is not the case that the disyllabic character of the Genitive termination -āī is 'nicht erweisbar'; a well-known line of Ennius shows it plainly enough.

P. 367. Hofmann adopts the view that the distinction between masc. and

fem. gender on the one hand, and neut. on the other, corresponds to the distinction between animate and inanimate, and, in the case of names of parts of the body, to that between active and passive. Thus *pes* is masc. but *cor* is neut. It might, however, be argued that the organ named *cor* is just as active as that named *pleumōn* or *nasus*. The fact is that analogy had been at work on those names for thousands of years, and that theories as to the original distribution of gender can be little more than guesswork. P. 476. The use of *iste* in the language of the law-courts ought to have been mentioned. P. 550. It is stated here that the perfect of simple verbs which are 'imperfective' in the present tense (*ire, currere, ducere*, etc.) is not used with an indication of direction of movement. That is not so. Cf. *Bacch.* 347, *iit salutatum ad forum*; *Cist.* 702, *hinc huc iit*. It is not at all clear that the distribution of 'perfective' and 'imperfective' aspects was preserved so clearly in these or other Latin verbs as Hofmann assumes. *Epid.* 605 has *abi intro*, 301 *quin tu is intro*; 76, *abi in malam rem*, but *Persa* 574, *i sis in malum cruciatum*, and in *Capt.* 721 *ducite* can scarcely have a different aspect from *abducite* of 733. P. 579. The details as to the use of the infinitive with adjectives are not all correct. *Facilis* + inf. occurs in Cicero, and *facile* in Terence. Plautus, to whom Hofmann denies the use of adj. + infin. altogether, has, *Trin.* 620, *difficile est reperiri amicum*. Slips of this kind are inevitable in such a work as this.

The Latin Grammar of Leumann and Hofmann, as it should be called, confers new distinction on an admirable series, and is indispensable to every student of Latin, whether Comparative Philologist or not.
J. FRASER.

THE ETRUSCANS.

The Etruscans, By D. RANDALL-MACIVER. Pp. 152; 15 photos and 1 map. Clarendon Press, 1927. 6s. net. 'IN this book Dr. Randall-MacIver gives the first short account of the origins, art, and civilisation of the Etruscans.' So writes the publisher;

and the reader will gratefully add that it is done in a most interesting and practical form. It may safely be said that neither in English nor in any other language is there an account of the Etruscan monuments and other remains which can be compared with Dr.

MacIver's lively presentation of their chief features, as shown by excavation down to the most recent times. The author of his already standard treatise on *The Villanovans and Early Etruscans* has established a new claim on our gratitude by the vigour and clarity of this brief sketch of the archaeological evidence, and on this ground the book deserves a cordial welcome. The descriptions of the tombs of Praeneste, of the tumuli at Caere, both with fine illustrations, of the *Situla of Certosa* (which he dates definitely 'just about 500 B.C.'), and the helpful guide to the Etruscan treasures of the Museum at Florence, are typical examples of the charm of Dr. MacIver's work.

It is, of course, unfortunate that in such matters the present writer can only express the thanks of a non-instructed reader. A special student of painting, vases, or sculptures would no doubt be able to detect the difficulties which Dr. MacIver has surmounted in dealing with all this material to produce his felicitous picture. But the editors of this Review have presumably turned to me as one who has approached the subject from a linguistic and historical standpoint. From that side the first thing to be expressed is cordial satisfaction that Dr. MacIver has escaped the influence of Mommsen's dogmatism which still seems to linger in unexpected quarters in this country. Dr. MacIver realises clearly the truth of the account of themselves given by the Etruscans¹ as immigrants from Asia Minor who entered Italy by sea and invaded the Plain of the Po from the south, not from the north; and this indeed, as the excavations show, hardly before 500 B.C. He has also been willing to accept the judgment of all sane students of language that the speech which the Etruscan documents represent is something alien from all the other languages of Italy and Greece (except for the epitaph in a clearly kindred tongue on the famous tomb of Lemnos).

But having said this much, anyone who is familiar with the ancient record

of the abundant impressions which the Etruscans made on all their neighbours, Greek, Roman, Campanian, and Umbrian, must be allowed to express his regret at the light-hearted way in which Dr. MacIver speaks of this volume of history: 'The unanimity of all ancient writers except Dionysius is not, of course,² valuable as evidence; they may all have been echoing the same original authority. . . . Most of the Greek . . . stories, as well as their slanderous comments on Etruscan life, are deliberate attempts to poison the wells of truth; nor are the Latin writers of the Augustan period, even Livy and Vergil, to be trusted. . . . They had no real sources of information' (p. 6).

Comment is really wasted on such a peremptory dismissal of witnesses who represent in a multitude of ways, but with complete accord as to the central facts, what the Etruscans themselves believed and said to their neighbours of different birth in Patavium or Verona or Mantua or Asisium or Arretium or Reate or Rome or Tusculum or Praeneste—to mention no other places which were homes of eminent Latin writers and in which Italians had jostled with Etruscans every day for centuries. When Dr. MacIver has read the historical evidence with even a fraction of the same zeal that he has given to the monuments, his judgment will be very different. To dismiss the evidence of a profound student of antiquity like Vergil, who was born in an Etruscan community, proud of its Etruscan traditions, and may possibly have had an Etruscan element in his family, as 'the biased references which occur occasionally in the works of the classical poets,' is merely to darken counsel. It is fortunate for Dr. MacIver's work that the testimony which he dismisses so cheerfully is not in conflict with what he deduces from the monuments, save in one matter—the character of Etruscan family-life and their ethical standpoint generally.

On this not unimportant question Dr. MacIver demands of his witnesses testi-

¹ Using the name, of course, in the sense of the ruling caste, and disregarding both the women of the land who bore many or most of the invaders' children and nursed them all, and the men who had submitted to their rule.

² This tell-tale phrase indicates that Dr. MacIver has made no study of the question. The temptation to use the words is one which every eager scholar has to learn for himself how to deal with.

mony which they are not competent to give. For example, on p. 51 he declares that the Greek writers made a 'false assertion' about a particular custom, on the strength of a fresco at Corneto. Even taking the fresco to be as he interprets it, the difference in point of decorum does not seem very great. But in any case, the absence of the particular feature mentioned by the Greek writers from such Etruscan frescoes as we possess cannot be held to be a convincing disproof. Of the tomb pictures more generally, Dr. MacIver writes: 'The subjects in the later centuries are horrific scenes of escort to the underworld by terrible demons, anticipations of Orcagna's nightmares in the Campo Santo of Pisa. Those of the fifth and sixth centuries are laughter-loving revels as care-free as the tales of the Decameron'; and he goes on to compare the pictures with those of the Egyptian tombs (cf. p. 127). But the kind of pictures to which he applies his zealous whitewash may be divined by a careful reading of pp. 128-129.

It is too late in the day to represent the Etruscans as very fine fellows. That they were artists and builders and sometimes good soldiers and diplomats their record shows. But it shows with equal clearness that they had no intellectual interests except in the weird superstitions attached to divination and astrology, if such an interest can be called intellectual. That the general temper of the ruling caste was insolent, sensual, and appallingly cruel is attested from the beginning to the end by abundant evidence. A typical fraction of it may be found in the doings of the Etruscan persons who appear in Roman history: Tarquin, Ahala, Cinna, Sulla, Perperna, Catilina, to mention no others. In view of such a record the 'spiritual identity' which Dr. MacIver actually claims (p. 3) between the School of Giotto and the temperament and outlook of the Etruscans is a desperate attempt to elevate purely technical characteristics to the moral plane. Those who know and revere Giotto's work the most will be the first to protest. The one Etruscan to whom Rome and Europe have ever been indebted—namely, Mae-

cenas—was one whose household illustrates well the attitude towards what Dr. MacIver calls 'the essentials of a decent family life' (p. 35), which was characteristic of even the most thoughtful members of his race.

The truth is that Dr. MacIver's judgment in matters of fact is warped by his enthusiastic admiration of Etruscan art, in which he will allow no faults, not even a lack of originality.¹ One mark of this is the confidence with which he expresses judgments on purely linguistic subjects. On p. 37 he makes the amazing statement that 'the common Roman name Lucius is nothing but the Latinised form of the Etruscan *Lucumo*.' Dr. MacIver is no doubt ignorant of the Varronian derivation of the name (which there is no reason whatever to doubt); and he is equally ignorant of the kind of changes that happened when an Etruscan word is borrowed into Latin. Another point every reader of the book can judge. He attributes 'terrifying beauty' to the painted terracotta figure of Apollo at Veii, which is reproduced in his frontispiece. The drapery and moulding of some of the limbs are pretty enough; but to apply the word 'beauty' to a statue whose face the artist has chosen to mark by a vulgar and revolting leer is a feat to which few of us will rise. Dr. MacIver himself describes it as 'remorseless and inhuman.' Whether the 'severity and beauty' which Dr. MacIver discovers are present in the original I cannot tell; but they are conspicuously absent from the photograph.

I am sorry to dissent so strongly from some of the details in this valuable book. If it is too much to hope that Dr. MacIver will study more deeply the historical records of the Etruscans before the book passes into another edition, at least it is fair to ask him to reconsider some of the statements which must have appeared, even to himself, to be dangerously near contradicting the facts which he himself admits.

R. S. CONWAY.

¹ At least not, *e.g.*, on p. 99; though on p. 20 he compares their power of using other people's ideas, very justly, to that of the Japanese. Compare also p. 30.

SPEECHES OF CICERO.

Cicero: Pro Lege Manilia, Pro Caecina, Pro Cluentio, Pro Rabirio Perduellionis. With an English translation by H. GROSE HODGE. Pp. xii + 496. (Loeb Classical Library.) London: Heinemann, 1927. Cloth, 10s. net; leather, 12s. 6d. net.

IN his prefatory note Mr. Hodge tells us that he has followed in these speeches the texts of J. R. (read 'J. C.') Nicol, Baiter, Fausset (read 'Fausset,' as on p. 413), and Heitland. It is impossible to point out all the passages where one has only to turn to better and more modern editions to find better readings, but three examples from the first speech are in 18, where *publicanis amissa uectigalia* should be read instead of *publicanis amissis uectigalia*, translated 'once the tax-farmers are lost'; 42 and 68, where the *clausulae* show that the readings *cognostis* and *gauderent* are preferable to *cognouistis* and *gaudeant*. Mr. Hodge gives thirty-two textual notes, of which eleven—those on pp. 36, 102, 108, 112, 130, 176, 184, 194, 202, 228, and 418—give false or misleading information.

But, although his text is not what it should be, Mr. Hodge's translation is extremely good. It is lively, full of resource and variety, yet never undignified. Its faults are a few archaisms, such as 'bethink you,' 'nay,' 'most chiefly' and the like, and its occasional lapses from accuracy. Words are left out in *Pro lege Man.* 12, 35; *Pro Caec.* 16, 27, 42; *Pro Cluent.* 15, 64, 68, 129 (four lines untranslated, as also *minime* in the last sentence, to the loss of all sense), 157; *Pro Rab.* 2, 13, 23, and 25. In *Pro lege Man.* 11 'defend' should be 'avenge,' 13 *expugnatione* does not mean

'assault,' 34 'unfit' for *nondum tempestino* is ambiguous in the context; *Pro Caec.* 80 'including ancient precedent' is not a translation of *etiam illa materia aequitatis* but of *Pantagathus ex omni memoria antiquitatis*, which is not mentioned; *Pro Cluent.* 69 *inuidiam atque offensionem* means not 'unpopularity and failure' but 'unpopularity and disfavour,' 72 it is not clear why *planus* should be translated by 'flâneur,' nor in 163 *egens quidam calumniator* by 'actually a needy individual,' 188 *generi* means not 'step-son' but 'son-in-law'; and in *Pro Rab.* 8 'What? is it likely that . . .' implies in the text not *Quid enim est tam ueri simile quam* but *Quid enim? est [tam] ueri simile [quam]*. Misprints are not many, but read at p. 54, l. 1 *quantam* for *quantum*; p. 73, l. 23 'as' for 'at'; p. 140, l. 3 *iure* for *iuri*; p. 340, l. 19 *fuerunt* for *fuerent*; p. 399, l. 18 'kinsman' for 'kinsmen'; p. 462, l. 23 *inuitatis* for *inuisitatis*; p. 471, l. 1 'made me' for 'me made,' and on p. 494 in the index of proper names 'Fabrateria' for 'Fabratera.' Mr. Hodge gives useful introductions to the speeches, but no bibliography.

The statement on p. 464 that '*uester* was not used for *tuus* till long after Cicero's time' ignores Catullus 39. 20 and 99. 6, and see also A. E. Housman, *C.Q.* III., 1909, pp. 244 sqq. I do not know why Mr. Hodge thinks that the second and fourth of these speeches have not been translated into English before. They have both been translated by C. D. Yonge.

Why is the title of the fourth speech given on the title-page and on the cover of the book as *Pro Rabirio Perduellionis*?

G. B. A. FLETCHER.

THE TEXT OF SALLUST.

Die Geschichte des Sallusttextes im Altertum. Von ERNST HÖHNE. Pp. 131. Munich, 1927.

THIS doctoral dissertation is not concerned with what Sallust wrote but with what writers of the first to fifth century A.D., when quoting from him, read. The author seeks to prove that a recension was made by Valerius

Probus and his pupils (but the evidence for a recension is not conclusive), and that Ω, the archetype ("ninth century" Ahlberg) of our medieval MSS., was a direct descendant, with but small variations, from this early text, called for convenience ω. Fronto's quotations were taken directly from it, the variations that occur being due to his

rhetorical and non-grammatical propensities. In the fourth century Sacerdos, Charisius, and others were quoting from the same tradition, but in the second half of the century Donatus, Servius and Diomedes had a corrupted text: the variants that they display are shown to be not merely due to 'neglegentia in excerpendo' as Nitzschner argued. [But the thesis here is not assisted by a reference made by the author to the reading *subegit* of the papyrus (first half of fourth century) in *Cat.* 10. 5 as proof of the better tradition unused by Servius, because Servius himself (though quoting *coegit* for this passage in his note on *Georg.* I. 463) also quotes the same *ad Aen.* IV. 283 with the traditional *subegit*.] In the beginning of the fifth

century ω reappears in the text of Arusian (perhaps after a new recension) and later in Cledonius and Priscian. But Augustine and the scribe who wrote the Sallust Oxyrhynchus Papyrus both had before them an already interpolated text containing extra 'Zusätze.' This second tradition (here called 'i') reappears in the *deteriores*, whose importance is thus demonstrated, while ω gave rise to V (the Vatican collection of speeches, etc.) as well as to Ω . The thesis is meritoriously worked out, and several portions (especially the section on Augustine's text) are illuminating; but when all is said the citations by the earliest authorities are few and short, and the reader is often obliged to substitute faith for conviction.

S. K. JOHNSON.

THE LOEB STATIUS.

Statius. With an English translation by J. H. MOZLEY. In two volumes. Pp. xxxii + 571, 595; 1 map. (Loeb Classical Library.) London: Heinemann (New York: Putnams), 1928. Cloth, 10s. each.

In the absence of modern commentaries on the epics, the appearance of a complete translation with brief notes on matter as well as text is an event of some importance. This version is generally accurate and readable and often felicitous. As compared with Slater's (there are some noticeable coincidences) it is more literal and prosaic; where Sl. says 'flushed with many a bumper' (*multo grauidus mero*), M. gives 'tipsy with much wine.' The literalness is sometimes excessive, and in other respects the English can be odd or even grotesque: thus S. i. 2. 162 'slothfulness,' 207 'the freshness (!) of his kisses,' ii. 2. 114 'reunites unequal strains,' iv. 4. 93 'vacant locks,' Th. v. 425 'known by their bearings,' A. i. 451 'barking waves.' 'Youth' does duty for *iuuenis*, *pubes*, and 'dames' for *matronae*, etc. Mozley is unduly fond of derivatives and frequently at fault in their use.

A more serious defect is the comparatively large crop of inaccuracies (moods, tenses, cases, *uester* = 'thy,' etc.), and

of misunderstandings of emphasis or sense. Occasionally right as against Slater, or more convincing, he is often mistaken. Thus S. i. 1. 21 *propellit* 'stirs up,' (31 *Pater* 'Sire' surely wrong), 38 translation inconsistent with text (misprint?), cf. 3. 44, 1. 41 *mundi curas* 'riddles of the universe,' 46 *equestres* 'of a horse,' 58 'even should an everlasting rock support thee,' 63 'and rattle,' 90 a ruinous inversion, 98 'about thy sole neck.' From the *Thebaid* I select a brief instance of misapprehension per book: i. 389 *tenues* 'gentle' (cf. ii. 145), ii. 295 *hac laude* 'with its praise,' iii. 90 (and elsewhere) *animae* 'life,' iv. 299 *cultu* 'customs,' v. 323 *fidem* 'to give protection,' vi. 802 *exit* 'goes at him,' vii. 678 *uiros* 'our troops,' viii. 372 *sua* 'their,' ix. 462 *aequoreo* 'seething,' x. 180 *tuentur* 'gaze at,' xi. 43 *alternus* 'field after field,' xii. 216 (and elsewhere) *nudus* 'bare.'

An adequate if rather unsympathetic introduction exaggerates the Propertian affinities. Mozley does not accept the identification of M with Poggio's MS. The text is decidedly less adventurous than the Oxford editors'. The explanatory notes, necessary for these poems, are generally terse and helpful. An appendix on the mythological points more commonly alluded to would have

saved many repetitions and cross-references and provided assistance at places where inconsistently none is offered.

Despite weaknesses and negligent proof-reading the edition may be recom-

mended for its substantial merits and in the hope that it will attract attention to an unduly depreciated writer (see Hardie and Garrod, *C.R.* VII. and XX.).

H. STEWART.

THE ROMANS IN THE RHINELAND.

Les Antiquités romaines de la Rhénanie.

BY JEAN COLIN. Pp. vi+296.

Twenty-six plates and 39 illustrations in the text. Paris: Les Belles-Lettres, 1927. 25 frs.

MONSIEUR COLIN's book is valuable for several reasons. In the first place, it gives an excellent bird's-eye view of the ground won in the last fifty years or so by archaeological research on the Rhine frontier of the Roman Empire. And this research has been so vast in extent, and so complicated in detail, that a popular summary of its main results cannot fail to be welcome; especially to those who, like the present reviewer, are getting tired of the outcry against specialisation and narrowness in archaeological studies. It is an outcry, in reality, against the advance of knowledge; for knowledge has never advanced, except by specialised labour at minute points, and, when the specialists have done their work, there will never be wanting men like Monsieur Colin to gather up the results and state them in a compact form. Unhappily, this work is often usurped by the half-educated journalist, and then it is valueless. Not so here. Monsieur Colin is an archaeologist himself, and writes out of a first-hand, detailed, and up-to-date knowledge of his subject. He knows how to select and compress; he has cut down the detail in order to emphasise—very tellingly and judi-

ciously—the general features; and he has arranged his material in a simple and orderly fashion, that shows how thoroughly he has mastered it. And it is a fine thing to have dealt with the ancient history of the Rhine in a really international spirit—a spirit utterly free from the false patriotism that has too often disfigured scientific work done since 1914. The book is not, however, without minor defects. Like most continental scholars, the author is ignorant, not only of English work in his own subject (which accounts for his omission of certain English names in summarising the history of archaeological science), but of England itself: he describes Winchester and 'Caervent' as situated on the shore of the Channel (the *south* shore of the Channel, he says, by a curious slip), and quotes, as illustrative of intercourse between Britain and the Trier district, an inscription which does not really prove his point, presumably through not knowing *C.I.L.* VII. 36, which does. But the main fault of the book is its illustrations. The line-blocks (except when borrowed) are made from wretched drawings, and many of the plates are reproduced not direct from photographs but from pulls from other half-tone blocks, and pretty hackneyed ones at that. Illustrated as it deserves, it would be a very fine volume.

R. G. COLLINGWOOD.

Ancient Sicyon, with a Prosopographia Sicyonia.

By C. H. SKALET. Pp. 223; 17 illustrations.

Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press; London: Milford; Oxford: University Press, 1928. 11s. 6d.

UNLIKE most of the Greek cities which have made a name for themselves, Sicyon did not play a sustained part in politics, but owed its fame to its school of artists. Accordingly Professor Skalet has produced a monograph in which the most important chapters are dedicated, not to the despots of Sicyon, but to its sculptors (among whom is included Polyclitus)

and to its painters. On the political and economic side there is not much more to be said beyond what Professor Skalet has given us, though a longer statement on the tyranny of Cleisthenes (and especially on his part in the Sacred War, which Professor Skalet appears to overrate), and on the trade relations (if any) of Sicyon, would have been desirable. The *Prosopographia* runs to 367 items, to which might be added a few more from papyri (collected in Heichelheim's *Auswärtige Bevölkerung im Ptolemäerreich*). But the real test of the present volume lies in its chapters on Sicyonian

art. These contain a formidable list of celebrities and useful descriptions of their *genres*. Professor Skalet is somewhat too reticent on the leading problems of Sicyonian art, e.g. on the provenance of 'proto-Corinthian' vases and the authorship of the Apoxyomenos. He favours a Sicyonian origin for the former and a Lysippic authorship of the latter, but does not give a full statement or a strong lead on either question. Nevertheless this section of his book should prove of value for reference, and it should open the eyes of those who are not connoisseurs to the importance of Sicyon in the history of Greek art.

M. CARY.

Eschine. Tome II. Contre Ctésiphon; Lettres. Texte établi et traduit par VICTOR MARTIN et GUY DE BUDÉ. Pp. 159. Paris: Société d'Édition *Les Belles Lettres*, 1928.

THIS is a continuation of the work of which the first volume has already been noticed in *C.R.* A short preface describes the relations of Athens and Macedon between 343 and 336 B.C. After an analysis of the charges against Ctésiphon, the editors point out that the whole action of Aeschines is a political move: on the first two counts there is very little to be said, and his insistence on the third, which is legally of slight importance, is due to his wish to discredit Demosthenes' policy as a whole. The material result of the trial—a fine inflicted on the prosecutor—was of little importance compared with the ruin of his political ambitions. The editors do full justice to Aeschines' ability as an advocate.

The letters, which are undoubtedly spurious, are included in this volume for convenience. Those of the first section, dating, perhaps, from the second century A.D., are described as possessing *un atticisme mitigé*, and they are probably the nine letters which were known to Photius. Letters 11 and 12 belong to the same class of ingenious forgery, though betrayed by anachronisms and other inaccuracies. No. 10 does not even purport to be written by Aeschines, and is totally unlike his style; it must have got into the collection by accident.

The footnotes which run through the volume and deal mostly with historical matter are concise, accurate, and illuminating.

J. F. DOBSON.

Il Canto Bucolico in Sicilia e nella Magna Grecia. EUGENIO DELLA VALLE. Pp. 72. Naples: A. Morano. 10 lire.

THE conclusions of this agreeably printed treatise may, I think, be represented by saying that Signor della Valle detects in the Bucolic Idylls of Theocritus two strains. The first is literary and descends from a developed bucolic poetry, monodic and amoebaeon, created by Stesichorus and his school; the second is inspired by direct observation of peasant singers. The first strain is Sicilian, the second, which is principally represented in the Italian Idylls, 4 and 5, is Italian.

I will not criticise these propositions in detail, for, the evidence being what it is, it seems to

me that one may hold almost any view one chooses about the origins of Bucolic Poetry. I cannot myself accept these, principally for two reasons. In the first place, Stesichorean bucolic reposes solely upon Aelian, *V.H.* 10. 18, and in spite of the spirited attempt here made to buttress that evidence I cannot believe in it; in particular, the silence of the Theocritean scholia seems to me more, not less, significant in view of their reference to Stesichorus in the non-bucolic *Id.* 18. In the second place the rustic singing contests mentioned in the *Εὔροις τῶν βουκολικῶν* may very likely be will-o'-the-wisps; but they explain what urgently requires explanation—the tendency to *ἀγών*-form in the Bucolic Idylls. But for that tendency I should myself enquire with confidence not who first wrote Bucolic Poetry, but who first wrote mimes, urban and bucolic, in hexameters. And I am still not sure that the second question is not the more pertinent, though to both echo returns the same impartial answer.

A. S. F. GOW.

(1) *Theodosius Tripolites. Sphaerica*. Von J. L. HEIBERG (Kopenhagen).

(2) *Theodosii de habitationibus liber, de diebus et noctibus libri duo*. Edidit DR. RUDOLF. FECHT (Mannheim).

Two vols. Pp. xvi+199; xii+126. Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1927. (1) M. 16; (2) M. 13.

(1) A PATHETIC interest attaches to the first of these volumes, containing the text of the *Sphaerica*, since it must presumably be the last text completed by the great scholar whose recent death we deplore. Dr. Heiberg gave us authoritative texts of Euclid (the *Elements* and scholia, the *Optics* and the fragments), Archimedes, Apollonius of Perga, and Heron of Alexandria: a service to Greek scholarship which it would be hard to parallel. Heiberg must have been acquainted with almost every Greek MS. in the libraries of Europe. It was he who discovered, as recently as 1906, in a palimpsest at Constantinople, the text of the *Method* of Archimedes supposed to be lost, the publication of which by Heiberg—a work of great difficulty owing to the fact that much of the writing was almost erased—has thrown a flood of light on the manner in which Archimedes made his great discoveries. We also owe to Heiberg several masterly sketches of Greek mathematics and science in small compass, which he wrote from time to time as contributions to various series of handbooks, and one of which has been translated into English (Clarendon Press).

By the usual sort of fatality experienced at some time or other by all persons who have to see books through the Press, Heiberg seems to have realised too late the necessity of altering the name 'Theodosius Tripolites.' It is now certain that our Theodosius came, not from Tripolis, but from Bithynia. The necessary correction is made in the *Corrigenda* at p. xvi, where it is noted that we should everywhere delete 'Tripolites.'

The *Sphaerica* is not an original work, but a methodical compilation setting out the geometry

of the sphere as developed by the Greeks, a subject on which a recognized textbook existed even before Euclid's time, since both Autolycus and Euclid quote as generally known many propositions in sphaeric which are formally presented in Theodosius' work, but not elsewhere.

It would seem that Heiberg had not the time on this occasion to give any account of earlier editions of the Greek text, since he only mentions the Arabic version (made as regards I. 1 to II. 5 by Qustā b. Lūqā, and as regards the rest by Thābit b. Qurra) and Latin translations from the Arabic, two of the twelfth century by Plato Tiburtinus and Gherard of Cremona respectively, and a third by an unknown translator, which seems to have been published at Venice in 1518. The Greek text was first edited by Joannes Pena in 1558; the next edition, by Joseph Hunt (Oxford, 1707), was mainly based on Pena, though some Oxford MSS. were also consulted; the last edition before Heiberg's was that of E. Nizze (1852), which still left much to be desired.

It is not likely that the text of the present edition will now be improved upon, for Heiberg himself collated the whole of the six best MSS., including the great MS. *Vaticanus gr.* 204 of the tenth century (which is also the best source for Aristarchus' treatise *On the Sizes and Distances of the Sun and Moon*), while taking account of a host of others, which he describes in his preface.

(2) The Greek text of the *De habitationibus* and *De diebus et noctibus* has never previously been edited; and it is satisfactory at last to have a text of these works with the scholia thereto which will hold its own for quality with those edited by Heiberg.

The earliest edition of the *De habitationibus* is a Latin version made from the Arabic by F. Maurolycus (1558), in which, however, only the enunciations are given in full, while the proofs are not those of Theodosius, but are given in a shortened form. Next Joseph Auria published a translation from the Greek (Rome, 1587) with some scholia; Auria also published a Latin translation of *De diebus et noctibus* (1591). In both works, however, Auria failed to follow the Greek in many places, and made arbitrary changes of his own, so that his editions are not of much service towards settling the text.

In a preface of twelve pages Dr. Fecht gives a good account of all that is known of the life and writings of Theodosius. T. L. HEATH.

Nemesios von Emesa: Anthropologie. By EMIL ORTH. Pp. viii + 120. Kaisersesch (Bez. Coblenz): Verlag Maria-Martental, 1925. RM. 4.

THIS is the first translation into German, or, apparently, into any modern language, of the work in which the Bishop of Emesa sums up, though not for Christian readers alone, the learning to be derived from a study of Greek philosophy as far as it was immediately concerned with man's powers. Dr. Orth has not entirely avoided making mistakes, but he has succeeded in producing a clear translation, which, although not primarily intended for the

Greek scholar, might yet be of help to one not familiar with the technical vocabulary of the later philosophers. F. H. SANDBACH.

Contributions Toward a Bibliography of Epic-tetus. By W. A. OLDFATHER (University of Illinois Bulletin, Vol. XXV., No. 12). Pp. xvii + 201 + [38]. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1927. \$3.50.

THIS book has a modest title, but contains 1,175 entries, which embrace criticism as well as texts and translations. If its only service were the laying of the ghosts of imaginary editions, it would still be a useful work. In an appendix is given a facsimile reproduction of the first vernacular translation of the *Encheiridion*, Jacob Schenk's German version, printed at Basel in 1534. F. H. SANDBACH.

Esope: Fables. Texte établi et traduit par

ÉMILE CHAMBRY. Paris: Société d'Édition 'Les Belles Lettres,' 1927. Frs. 25.

THIS popular edition of 358 Aesopic Fables in pleasing type, with a lucid and idiomatic French translation *en face*, presents each Fable in a single version without critical notes (for which see the elaborate *apparatus criticus*, based upon forty-six MSS., in M. Chambray's earlier edition). The text is not quite identical. In Fable 109, instead of the desperate *σπῆλαιον ποιήσουσι*, the editor now prints his conjecture *τροφήν ἑαυτοῖς πορίσουσι*.

The Introduction deals attractively with (1) the life of Aesop, (2) the legend of Aesop, (3) the history of the Aesopic Fable (with acknowledgements to Hausrath and Denis), (4) the MSS. M. Chambray claims considerable antiquity for the presumed originals—for the archetype of P (his first class), at least the age of Plutarch, with an older nucleus, perhaps due to Demetrius of Phalerum. He holds that the Papyrus Golenischeff belongs to the third or fourth century of our era: cf. now P. Oxy. XVII. 2083, another fragment of the same version of the *Life of Aesop*, which Dr. Hunt dates in the late fourth or the fifth century.

Despite a few late words and constructions, *Esope*, which blends humour so well with wisdom, and, being by no single author, reflects the mind of the Greek people, will be useful in schools as well as for *le grand public*.

The following corrections of text may be noted: *κατεβέβηκε* (Fab. 40), *ἀλεκτοροφωνίαν* (89), *συναντιόντων* (178), *γλώσσαλον* (201), *μεμολυμένος* (214), *ὀρνιθοθήρας* (283). A letter is missing in *περιττότερον* (272), *ἡτῶνται* (358). W. G. WADDELL.

A Guide to Etruscan Antiquities. By G. Buonamici and A. Neppi Modona. Pp. 124; 38 photographic reproductions, and archaeological map. Florence: 'Ente per le Attività Toscane,' 1928. 7 lit. (sic).

THIS little book professes to give 'a brief, lucid summary' of what is known of the history, art, and civilisation of the Etruscans. Professor Buonamici has contributed a clear and useful

account of the results attained by the scientific study of their language, with references to recent works on the subject.

J. FRASER.

Clan non è Filius. By 'Ulisse.' Rome: Tip. Ed. 'La Speranza,' 1928.

ONE of the few Etruscan words of which the meaning has been considered to be well established is *clan*. The author of this pamphlet is dissatisfied with the accepted translation because, among other reasons, (1) in Latin inscriptions from Etruria the place of *clan* is taken by *natus*; (2) *natus* is not equivalent to *filius* in legal language; and (3) in Latin *natus* is used with the abl. of the name of parent, while the Etruscan *clan* depends on a gen. He comes to the conclusion that *clan* means 'tribe,' and connects the word with Lat. *colonia*, Gaelic *clan* (which, unfortunately, is simply the Latin *planitia*), and various Greek, Slavonic, and 'Illyrian' words with which it has patently nothing to do.

J. FRASER.

Florusstudien: Beiträge zur Kenntnis des rhetorischen Stils der silbernen Latinität. Inaug.-Diss. von SVEN LILLIEDAHL. (Lunds Universitets Årsskrift, N.F. Avd. 1, Bd. 24, Nr. 7.) Pp. 102. Lund: Gleerup; Leipzig: Harrassowitz, 1928. Price, 3 Swedish crowns.

THIS work handles certain problems of syntax and style in Florus' historical work. It is divided into four main parts: syntactical, stylistic, text-critical, and rhythmical. The syntactical problems discussed are the use of the genitive, dative, and ablative cases; numerals; substantial use of the neuter plural of adjectives; *ipse* and the personal pronouns; the historic future and the pluperfect tenses; pregnant use of adverbs; *nam*, *enim*, adversative, copulative, and disjunctive particles; polysyndeton and parataxis. The stylistic section includes treatment of various forms of brachylogy; personification; enallage; repetition of the same word after a short interval; order of words. The text-critical part considers the use of a compound verb for the simple verb, and *vice versa*; rhetorico-pathetic final clauses; omission of pronominal subject to accusative and infinitive clauses; particular passages. The rhythmical chapter treats the question of the *clausulae* at length.

The work was produced under the direction of the master, Löfstedt, and calls for no adverse comment. Earlier works from the same school have familiarised us with the extensive knowledge of the modern bibliography of Latin syntax possessed by the Swedish latinists, as well as with the sanity of their judgment and the lucidity and charm with which their views are presented. This work is no exception to the rule.

The second edition of Friedländer's *Petronius*, 1906, might have been mentioned; and it is strange that Lucan has been overlooked in the section on the repetition of the same word after a short interval, for surely no Latin poet shows this characteristic more than Lucan, who was also read by Florus. It is suggested to emend

NO. CCCXVII. VOL. XLII.

Valerius Maximus 16, 21 ff. (Kempf), by reading *sed* for *se et* of the MSS. I should suggest rather *sed et*, and explain the *se* as due to a miscopying of the abbreviation for *sed*, which consists of an *s* followed by a comma.

A. SOUTER.

Texts for Students, No. 43: Cyprian, De Unitate Ecclesiae. The Latin text translated, with an Introduction and brief notes, by E. H. BLAKENEY, M.A. Pp. 64. London, etc.: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge. Cloth, 2s. 6d.

MR. BLAKENEY has taken the text of Gersdorf, 'corrected here and there by Hartel's,' as the basis of this handy edition, to which he has added an admirable translation, an adequate introduction, and a few notes. It is probably Gersdorf that is responsible for the unsightly spelling *foecundus*; and in Chapter XVI. (14) *fidelissimi fratres* is, by a slip, translated as if it were *dilectissimi fratres*. While one may regret that Mr. Blakeney did not collate some hitherto unused MSS., the edition may be unreservedly commended to students.

A. SOUTER.

Vita Sancti Ambrosii, Mediolanensis Episcopi, a Paulino eius Notario ad beatum Augustinum conscripta. A Revised Text and Commentary, with an Introduction and Translation. By SISTER MARY SIMPLICIA KANIECKA. Pp. xvi + 186. Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America, 1928.

THIS is Vol. XVI. of the now well-known Patristic Studies of the Catholic University of America, and continues the section devoted to Ambrosian writings. The general plan of the volume is the same as that of other volumes in the series. Paulinus' life of St. Ambrose is well worth a separate edition, being a primary authority for the life of the great bishop. The edition, being a doctor's dissertation, shows certain signs of inexperience. There are too many misprints, some ugly mistakes in grammar (*consortio* for *consortium*; *conuersus*, participle, and *hordeaceus*, adjective, taken as nouns, p. 13), omissions (*tuitio*, § 31, omitted on p. 13; *tunc temporis*, § 11, on p. 19; *siquidem*, § 39, on p. 32), confusion of tenses with moods (p. 30). Yet the collations of manuscripts render the volume indispensable to scholars. For the editor has used photographs of four MSS., of which Paris B.N. 1771 (saec. VIII.-IX.) is the oldest and most important. It is a pity that she has sometimes lacked the necessary courage to put the true reading in the text. Students of Latin proper names will be interested to learn that this old MS. furnishes a crop of new examples of the better spelling *Mediolanium*, which, however, is not printed in the text, as it ought to be. And there are many other instances where the true reading is to be found in the apparatus or can be elicited from it—e.g. *semigrauit* (§ 27). The translation is in the main correct; but in § 41 *distrahebantur* should have been translated 'were sold,' not 'were torn asunder.' The notes are worthy of commendation, but some words and expressions deserved annotation and have not received it (e.g. *elenim*,

§ 12, 37 [where punctuation is wrong]; *nunc usque*, § 46, 49). A. SOUTER.

Die Katakombenwelt. Von OSKAR BEYER. Pp. viii+153; 17 figures in text and 30 plates. Tübingen: Mohr, 1927.

THE author studies Catacomb Christianity *religionsgeschichtlich*. His attempt to reconstruct the psychology of early Roman Christianity from a study of its literature, local setting, symbolism and art is brief and summary, but is carried out with real historical insight, and merits the attention of all serious students of the subject. He is free from the sectarian prejudice which has coloured so much of the literature of this subject, and if his treatment tends to be 'impressionistic,' it is the impressionism of a well-informed and sympathetic mind. He is also commendably free from the tendency to generalise from 'Catacomb Christianity' to pre-Constantinian Christianity as a whole, against which a documented warning was issued in *C.R.* XL., p. 147. His sketch of early symbolism is thrown a little out of perspective by a disregard of relative chronology, inevitable perhaps on so restricted a canvas; but on the whole stress is laid on what is important, and the illustrations are well chosen and admirably reproduced.

W. M. CALDER.

S. Augustini De Civitate Dei, I.-XIII. Ex recensione B. DOMBART quatum recognovit

A. KALB. Leipzig: Teubner, 1928. M. 10. DR. KALB has taken up the task long committed to Dr. Dombart, whose Augustinian studies began with a thesis in 1862, and who, we are glad to learn from the present volume, is still living and still interested in his old pursuit. The text of the *De Civitate* is so well ascertained from an almost unequalled range of MSS., two of which date back to the sixth and seventh century, that there is little opportunity for an editor to make changes in the text. A comparison of Kalb with Hoffmann's edition in the Vienna Corpus shows few variations. The only fresh source of importance is a MS. sent from Leningrad to Munich for the editor's use. It is sad that the publisher should have doomed this edition to be produced *artis photomechanicae quae dicitur opera*. The result is not quite worthy of St. Augustine or of the house of Teubner.

E. W. WATSON.

Pervigilium Veneris. Tekst en vertaling met inleiding en commentaar voorzien door DR. C. BRAKMAN, Jz. Pp. 84. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1928. Fl. 1.60.

DR. BRAKMAN starts with his text, with translation on the opposite page, continues with a consideration of possible authors (he rejects in turn the claims of Annius Florus, Sidonius Apollinaris, and Tiberianus, and decides for a poet in the circle of Symmachus), remarks on some peculiarities of language (present for future, replacement of genitive by *de* with ablative, and the use of the word *congreg*), touches

lightly on metre and prosody (of this more presently), analyses the poem, and then proceeds to an elaborate textual and grammatical commentary.

I do not feel that there is anything very new to be said about the *Pervigilium*, and will therefore indicate the innovations which Dr. Brakman proposes in the text:

21 'Solvit tumentis peplo.' The corrupt word has been variously emended: *umentis*, *urentis*, *undantis*, *urgentis*. B. suggests *uventis*, supporting it by passages from Silius Italicus, several of which are themselves conjectures.

11 (B. places ll. 9-12 after 62 with Heidentmann, etc.) 'de maritis imbribus.' I have always thought the correction *marinis* feeble. B.'s conjecture *de maris tumoribus* is a shade better; but surely the text can stand.

74 'Romuli matrem.' B. thinks that this is a gloss, which has crept into the text, on *Iliae gentem*.

There are a good many misprints in the book, but *laudatus* (p. 53) in false concord with *Delia* is a reproach to Dr. Brakman; and on p. 14 the mis-spelling *Brittanos* (in the Florus-Hadrian interchange of lampoons) has perhaps induced him to suggest or accept, as the missing third line, *latitare per Germanos*, which is surely metrically impossible; and a doubt of the soundness of Dr. Brakman's prosody is raised by his suggestion on p. 26 that *Cypridis* and *Venerem* may almost be regarded as tribrachs, 'because *s* and *m* at the end of a word were pronounced very lightly.' He is unwilling to accept the emendations which remove the fifth-foot spondee in ll. 60 and 91.

In an appendix he combats the recent views of J. Trotzki (in *Philologus* 81) on the *motif* of the poem. S. GASLEE.

The Enigmas of Symphosius. A thesis . . . for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy. By RAYMOND THEODORE OHL. Pp. 137. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, 1928.

IT was quite worth while to produce a separate edition of the work of Symphosius, an author of unknown date, and Dr. Ohl has done his work well. The volume comprises a bibliography, introduction, text with critical apparatus, English translation, commentary, and index. The printing is at times inaccurate—six errors, for example, occurring in the first thirteen pages. The following further points might be mentioned: Optatian might have been mentioned along with Ausonius (p. 12); the allusion to the great patristic scholar as 'one Iacopus Sirmondus' (p. 51) will provoke a smile among more experienced students; read 'P.' Decius Mus for 'D.' Decius Mus (p. 59); read 'utter' for 'hurt' (p. 61); read 'drawn out into thin metal' instead of 'drawn from thin metal' (p. 87); on p. 93 Lucan III. 698 *scrutari fretum* might have been quoted, and on the same page *praestat* should be rendered 'performs' rather than 'takes upon itself'; on p. 108 read *sed altis* in

the familiar line of Martial, not *et altis*; on p. 110 *summe parens mundi* (Lucan IV. 110) should have been quoted; on p. 120, if a dactylic trisyllable meaning 'red' is wanted, why not read *russea*? on p. 128 read *funiambul*; parallels to *nomen inane* (p. 132) might have been cited from Georges-Mühlmann, col. 459 (Cic., Lucr., Hor., Sen., Tac.), and *nullo crimine* (same page) might also have been illustrated.

A. SOUTER.

Několik Archeologických Památek z Východního Bulharska (Some Arch. Monuments from East Bulgaria). By A. SALAČ and K. ŠKORPIL. Pp. 83 (8 of French summary); 14 half-tone plates of inscriptions. Prag: Česká Akad. Věd a Umení, 1928.

SOME thirty inscriptions (five in Latin) from the east coast of Bulgaria, largely from Varna (Odessus), explanations by Salač, readings, descriptions, and verifications by the veteran K. Škorpil—a fair specimen of the epigraphy of the region; dedications to the Thracian horseman, to Zeus and Hera, to Heracles, Athena Sotira, Demeter, Apollo Aularchenus, Derzelas, Hermes, and local heroes; the usual epitaphs, with some in bad verse, especially a Latin one. Of more particular interest are a dedication to Manimazus from the guild of *θυεῖραι*; a stone marking the boundary between Thrace and Odessus; a record of how C. Julius Commodus Orfitianus, a known official, made in 155 A.D. *burgos et praesidia* to protect Thrace—the first occurrence of the word *burgos*, curiously enough found at Burgas. The oldest item is the stele of Paidarche, c. 400 B.C., with a pretty anthemion. It is characteristic of a language with live flexion that Salač unconsciously forms a possessive adjective from the lady's name, and writes *Paidarkina stela*.

E. H. MINNS.

Dacia: An Outline of the Early Civilizations of the Carpatho-Danubian Countries. By VASILE PÂRVAN. Pp. 214. Cambridge: University Press, 1928. 7s. 6d.

THE production of this book in English is a work of piety on the part of Messrs. I. L. Evans and M. P. Charlesworth of St. John's College, forming a memorial of three lectures given by Professor Pârvan at Cambridge in 1926, about a year before his death. It serves as an admirable summary of the author's work, first of his great book *Getica*, which surveys the archaeology of the country from a period corresponding to Villanova down to La Tène III., and then his articles on the Greek and the Roman penetration of the lands along the Lower Danube. His main thesis is that the basis of the population goes back to the early Danubian cultivators, and that it has always been more ready to assimilate influences from Italy and the West, Villanovan, Celtic, and finally Roman, than from the East, Greek and Scythian.

Hence the complete romanization of the Dacians and their survival as Rumanians is the natural result of a very ancient process. Each

of these foreign influences he analyses and shows its distinctive character. The illustrations are mostly devoted to the earlier period; no space could be spared for Greek or Roman objects with their more familiar forms, but the text gives a brilliant sketch of the relations between the Hellenic cities and the interior, and of the policy of Rome. An interesting point is that romanization was more permanent when applied to a homogeneous nation with history and traditions of its own, such as the Daci, than to regions nearer Italy where Illyrians, Thracians, and Celts offered no solid foundation, as in Upper Moesia and Dalmatia; hence the Rumanians are now cut off by Slavs and Magyars from their fellow Latin-speakers.

A map is supplied, which, strangely enough, omits to show the mountains; there is also a geographical index, very useful in that it mostly gives Magyar and German equivalents for the Rumanian forms used in the text.

E. H. MINNS.

Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome. Vol. VI. Pp. 167; 54 plates. American Academy in Rome, 1927.

THIS handsome volume contains seven articles on various themes. Prentice Duell contributes an admirable account of the Tomba del Triclinio at Tarquinia, with fifteen plates, five of which are magnificent coloured reproductions of the steadily perishing paintings, which will form an invaluable record. Lillian B. Lawler has an interesting article on Maenads, in which she attempts to deduce from ancient monuments, especially vase paintings, and from literary evidence the steps and figures of 'the Maenad dance,' which she concludes to have been a definite form, practised by real women in Thyiad dances. Articles by Holmes Van Mater Dennis 3d and Elizabeth Baily Lawrence deal with the Garrett and Modena Manuscripts of Marcanova, which contain imaginative Renaissance drawings of Roman buildings, here reproduced in twenty-six plates. Other articles deal with the Aqua Alsietina on the Janiculum (A. W. Van Buren and Gorham Phillips Stevens), and with a papyrus concerned with Apollonius' estate (W. L. Westermann). The most important contribution to knowledge in the volume is Rhys Carpenter's proof that the Terme Boxer is signed by the same Apollonius, son of Nestor, who signed the Torso Belvedere.

D. S. ROBERTSON.

The Roman Pottery at Crambeck, Castle Howard.

By PHILIP CORDER. Pp. 45, with map and 21 plates. Published by the Roman Antiquities Committee of the Yorkshire Archaeological Society, 1928. 5s. net.

THIS valuable pamphlet gives the fruit of excavations in 1926-7 on the site of Roman pottery kilns near Malton, carried out by boys of Bootham School at York. Amateur labour of this kind can be employed where the work is very simple and straightforward, and where perfect discipline and good supervision are secured; and in this case it is clear that these conditions

were fulfilled. Four kilns have been explored, arranged in pairs, two kilns being fired from each of two stoke-holes; and good plans and photographs of these structures are reproduced. But the chief interest lies in their products, of which over 200 types are illustrated in proper sectional drawings, with a commentary. The author has not attempted to trace parallels and analogies for his various types in any detail. He has preferred to leave them to speak for themselves. In some ways this diminishes the value of his report; but the main thing is that the types should be published, and nothing else matters. It should be added that Mr. Corder's conclusions about the chronology of his types and the history of the site are obviously correct. In spite of some second-century Samian and a coin of Nerva, the evidence of typology makes it clear that these kilns were not working earlier than the late third century, and that their chief productive period was the first three quarters of the fourth. In this they closely resemble the kilns explored by Mr. Heywood Sumner in the New Forest. Further, it seems almost certain that Mr. Corder is right in assigning the close of their activity to the disturbed period of the 360's. That is important, because it strengthens the already large body of evidence which suggests that in those years the economic life of the Romano-British countryside was definitely wrecked. Mr. Corder and the Bootham School are to be congratulated on a very useful piece of work.

R. G. COLLINGWOOD.

The Roman Fort at Ribchester. Edited by the REV. J. H. HOPKINSON. Third edition, revised and enlarged by Donald Atkinson. Pp. 35, with 10 plans and illustrations. Manchester: University Press, 1928. 1s. net.

CANON HOPKINSON'S useful pamphlet on Ribchester has entered upon a new phase of life under the care of Mr. Atkinson, whose name is enough to guarantee its thoroughness, accuracy, and scholarly qualities. The recent excavations, conducted by Mr. Atkinson himself, are reported upon, and the pamphlet gives an admirably clear and trustworthy description of the site and summary of all we know about it. There are also appendices containing an account of all known inscriptions from Ribchester, and notes on the contents of the museum. Everyone knows the local rhyme quoted by Camden:

It is written upon a wall in Rome
'Ribchester was as rich as any town in
Christendom,'

and has reflected that a good many odd things have been written upon walls in Rome at various times; but the proverb has come true to this extent, that very few Roman fort-sites possess so excellent a museum of their own finds as Ribchester, and still fewer can provide visitors to the museum with so excellent a guide to the remains and collections. These are riches indeed.

R. G. COLLINGWOOD.

Fontes Historiae Religionis Germanae. Collegit CAROLUS CLEMEN. Berolini: apud Walter de Gruyter et socios, 1928. Pp. 112. 5 M.

THIS is the third volume of that excellent series *Fontes historiae religionum*. To those who know the bulky works which used to be produced on the subject of German paganism, its modest size may come as something of a revelation; for it contains everything, from Caesar to Saxo Grammaticus, which is of the smallest evidential value, outside of Old Icelandic literature. Apart from Caesar and Tacitus, it contains some passages familiar to every historian, such as the famous letter of Gregory the Great to Mellitus giving instructions for the Christianising of English feasts and fanes, the weird story from Procopius about the ferry-men of the dead, and several different versions of the legend of the Lombards' name. But there is much more, gathered from codes of barbarian law, penitentials, decrees of councils, and lives of saints, which the ordinary classical student may be pardoned for not knowing even by name. The reader must not expect very classical Latinity—*si quis alterum herburgium clamauerit hoc est striporcium* is not exactly Ciceronian, for instance—and he will find reason to hope that the revisers of Ducange may make speedy progress with their labours. But odd grammar and half-German, half-Latin vocabulary ought not to deter anyone interested in the religious history of mankind from careful study of this reliable source of information concerning the ancient beliefs of a great part of Central Europe.

H. J. ROSE.

Anthimi De Observatione Ciborum ad Theodoricum regem Francorum epistula: recensuit EDUARDUS LIECHTENHAN (Corp. Med. Lat. viii, 1). Pp. xx+57. Leipzig: Teubner, 1928. R.M. 6; bound, R.M. 7.50.

VALENTIN ROSE'S edition of Anthimus, which appeared in 1877, was based on a rather slender critical apparatus, and Rose was rather too much inclined to conform the Latin to a literary standard. The work, apart from the interest of its subject-matter, is of considerable interest to the student of colloquial Latin. The task of an editor is, in such cases, one of considerable difficulty, for how is he to discriminate between the colloquialisms due to the scribes and those due to the original author? Whether one agrees in every case with the editor in the use of his critical material or not, he deserves our best gratitude for the fullness of his critical apparatus.¹ Nor are the introduction and the luxurious indexes less deserving of commendation. Dr. Liechtenhan's work is in every way worthy of the admirable series to which it belongs. On p. 41 'Lexikographie' should be 'Lexikographie'; on p. 43 'domesticus' should be 'domesticus.'

A. SOUTER.

¹ Yet one would have welcomed details of the manuscript readings on p. 4, l. 2 (the sacred names).

Physiologus. A Metrical Bestiary of Twelve Chapters. By BISHOP THEOBALD. Translated by ALAN WOOD RENDALL, Lieut.-Colonel V.D., Hon. A.D.C. to the Viceroy of India, 1897-1901. 8vo. Pp. xxvii + 100, with illustrations and facsimiles. London: John and Edward Bumpus, 1928. 10s. 6d.

BISHOP BURY, who writes the Introduction to this little book, calls a Bestiary 'the work of one who had great leisure for observation'; I am of a somewhat different opinion. Leisure of a kind these good men had, but they lacked both the art and practice of observation. A mediaeval Bestiary reads like Aelian, Pliny, and *The Bad Boy's Book of Beasts* rolled into one, with a little seasoning from *The Arabian Nights* thrown in; its ancient stories are told and retold in Greek and Latin, in Syriac and Ethiopic, in Icelandic, Anglo-Saxon and Provençal, by pious monks who know the ant and the spider neither better nor worse than they know the lion and the whale. But all the while the Bestiary is an excellent thing in its way; in the most secluded cloister it kept the love of beast and bird alive in men's hearts, and it made up for a plentiful lack of scientific zoology by its really fine moral truths and spiritual allegories. Now and then the task fell into other hands, who drew a different moral from the same themes, as when the Minnesingers composed their *Bestiaire d'Amour*.

One of the smaller Bestiaries is the Latin one which Colonel Rendall has now translated and edited; it is in verse, in twelve chapters, and

is ascribed to a certain Theobald. It was printed at Cologne in 1492, and was very well described (though Colonel Rendall does not mention the fact) by Thierfelder, in Naumann's *Serapeum*, about sixty years ago.

There has been much doubt as to who Theobald was; but Land, a Leyden professor who wrote the admirable article 'Physiologus' in the ninth edition of the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, suggested that he was an eleventh-century Abbot of Monte Cassino. Colonel Rendall made his pilgrimage accordingly to the great House of the Benedictines, and his account of the Abbey in its present state and his beautiful photographs of it are not the least valuable part of his little book. What he heard from the learned Benedictine in charge of the Archives, about Theobald and his Bestiary, and about articles on this and other Bestiaries in the *Studia Picena*, the *Rivista Storica Benedettina*, and other scholarly publications of the Order, is all told in the Colonel's pleasant and interesting book.

The Cologne text is printed in facsimile with a full translation, and with three different versions of the Latin text. The corrupt state of every one of these will delight the textual critic, and the student of metre will be refreshed by the great simplicity of

*Vermis araneus exiguis
plurima fila net assiduus*, etc.

D'ARCY W. THOMPSON.

SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS

PHILOLOGISCHE WOCHENSCHRIFT.

(JUNE—AUGUST, 1928.)

GREEK LITERATURE.—Eusebius' *Werke*, Band 7: *Die Chronik des Hieronymus*. Zweiter Teil: *Lesarten der Handschriften und quellenkritischer Apparat zur Chronik*. Herausg. von R. Helm [Leipzig, 1926, Hinrichs. Pp. xlviii + 778] (Mras). Masterpiece of research and industry.—C. Hude, *Scholias in Thucydidem ad optimos codices collata* [Leipzig, 1927, Teubner. Pp. v + 437] (Widmann). The fruit of thirty years of laborious work. Contains introduction, text, critical apparatus, and index of names; thorough and conscientious.—D. Gromska, *De sermone Hyperidis*. *Studia Leopolitana* III. [Leopoli, 1927. Pp. iv + 100] (Ammon). Thorough, careful, and clear; especially helpful for beginnings of *Kovij* in H.—A. Rostagni, *La Poetica di Aristotele con introduzione, commento e appendice critica* [Turin, 1927, Chiantore. Pp. xciv + 147] (Gudeman). Genuine and solid achievement in spite of some objections. Introduction and commentary reliable, but textual recension less satisfactory. Reviewer discusses at length.

LATIN LITERATURE.—K. Springer, *Supplementum Tullianum*. *Συμπληρωμὴ ἐπιστολῶν quae ad Ciceronianas annorum 68-49 spectant* [Charlottenburg, 1927, Hoffmann. Pp. 254] (Klotz). Collection of passages containing references to C.'s letters arranged chronologically. S. has made the most of his material and his interpretations can generally be accepted. Valuable for understanding of Cicero.—G. Ammon, *Germania von Tacitus, Übersetzung mit Einleitung und Erläuterungen*. Zweite, neu bearbeitete und stark vermehrte Auflage [Bamberg, 1927, Buchner. Pp. xciv + 236, with 90 illustrations and 9 maps] (Gudeman). Contains comprehensive introduction, excellent and copious notes, and very full bibliography. Quite indispensable.—C. Pascal, *T. Lucrezio Caro. Il primo libro del De rerum natura. Introduzione e note* [Turin, 1928, Paravia. Pp. xliii + 164] (Hosius). Brief introduction; thorough and illuminating notes on subject matter, with some new and acute interpretations.

HISTORY AND LAW.—R. J. Bonner, *Lawyers and Litigants in ancient Athens. The genesis of the legal profession* [University of Chicago Press, 1927. Pp. x + 276] (Ziebarth). In-

tended for the general reader. Very interesting.—L. Wenger, *Der heutige Stand der römischen Rechtswissenschaft. Erreichtes und Erstrebtes* [München, 1927, Beck. Pp. x+113] (Grupe). Excellent both in arrangement and in content; a miniature encyclopaedia.—A. Stein, *Der römische Ritterstand. Ein Beitrag zur Sozial- und Personengeschichte des römischen Reiches* [München, 1927, Beck. Pp. xiv+503] (Enzlin). Impossible to exaggerate the value of this book. S. is a master of historical research.

LANGUAGE.—G. Ghedini, *La lingua greca di Marco Aurelio Antonino. Parte prima: Fonetica e morfologia* [Milan, 1927. Pp. xvi+91] (Ammon). Shows much knowledge and industry.—H. Frisk, *Le Périple de la mer érythrée, suivi d'une étude sur la tradition et la langue* [Göteborg, 1927] (Schmid). Useful edition of this geographically and linguistically important text. F. has exact knowledge of recent *Koivḗ* research, and his description of the language is a welcome contribution.—*Kleinasiatische Forschungen, Band I., Heft I.* Herausg. von F. Sommer und H. Ehelolf [Weimar, 1927, H. Böhlau Nachf. Pp. ii+

160] (Gustavs). Attempts to provide meeting ground for researchers in Hittite whose articles have hitherto been widely scattered in different journals. Contributions by Kretschmer, Sommer, Friedrich, and others.

EPIGRAPHY AND ARCHAEOLOGY.—*Inscriptiones Graecae. Vol. II. et III. editio minor, pars altera, fasc. prior: Tabulae magistratuum.* Ed. J. Kirchner [Berlin, 1927, de Gruyter. Pp. iii+331] (Ziebarth). Marks a big advance in new edition of Attic inscriptions and includes 325 additional items.—*Monumentum Antiochenum. Die neugefundene Aufzeichnung der Res gestae divi Augusti im pisdischen Antiochia.* Herausg. und erläutert von W. M. Ramsay und A. von Premerstein. Klio, Beiheft XIX. [Leipzig, 1927, Dieterich] (Stein). A model of method. Reviewer is full of admiration and gratitude.—F. Noack, *Eleusis. Die baugeschichtliche Entwicklung des Heiligtums. Mit Beiträgen von J. Kirchner, A. Körte, und A. Orlandos* [Berlin, 1927, de Gruyter. Pp. 333, with 112 figures in text; also one vol. with 44 plates] (Fiechter). Important treatise of immense scope, but conclusions rather obscured by elaborate method of presentation.

BOOKS RECEIVED

All publications which have a bearing on classical studies will be entered in this list if they are sent for review. The price should in all cases be stated.

* * Excerpts or extracts from periodicals and collections will not be included unless they are also published separately.

- Bailey (C.) *The Greek Atomists and Epicurus. A Study.* Pp. viii+619. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1928. Cloth, 24s. net.
- Conway (R. S.) *Harvard Lectures on the Vergilian Age.* Pp. viii+162; illustrations. Cambridge, U.S.A.: Harvard University Press (London: Milford), 1928. Cloth, 11s. 6d. net.
- Cooper (L.) *A Concordance to Boethius, The Five Theological Tractates and The Consolation of Philosophy.* Pp. xii+467. Cambridge, U.S.A.: Mediaeval Academy of America, 1928. Paper, \$5 post-free.
- Duff (A. M.) *Freedmen under the Early Roman Empire.* Pp. xii+252; illustrations. Oxford: Clarendon Press (London: Milford), 1928. Cloth, 12s. 6d. net.
- Duthie (A.) *Readings from Cicero. Verres.* Pp. 107. London: Harrap, 1928. Cloth, 1s. 6d.
- Halliday (W. R.) *The Greek Questions of Plutarch. With a new translation and commentary.* Pp. 233. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1928. Cloth, 15s. net.
- Herkenrath (R.) *Der ethische Aufbau der Ilias und Odyssee.* Pp. 384. Paderborn: Schöningh, 1928. Paper, M. 7.50 (bound, 9).
- Mater Iesu et Mater Iudae. *Carmen praemio aureo ornatum in certamine poetico Hoeufftiano. Accedunt tria carmina laudata. Edidit Academia Regia Discipularum Nederlandica.* Amsterdam, 1928.
- Murray (G.) *Jane Ellen Harrison. An address delivered at Newnham College, October 27, 1928.* Pp. 21. Cambridge: Heffer, 1928. Paper.
- Richards (F.) *The Aeneid of Virgil, translated, with an introductory essay.* Pp. xiv+361. London: Murray, 1928. Cloth, 15s.
- Rogers (H. L.) and Harley (T. R.) *Cicero the Politician. Being the Pro Sestio and Philippic II partly in the original and partly in translation.* Pp. 226. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1928. Cloth, 3s. 6d.
- Royal Commission on Historical Monuments (England). *An Inventory of the Historical Monuments in London. Vol. III. Roman London.* Pp. xxi+207; 68 plates, and other illustrations. London: H.M. Stationery Office, 1928. Cloth, 18s. net.
- Schilling-Wollny (K.) *Aristoteles' Gedanke der Philosophie.* Pp. 133. Munich: E. Reinhardt, 1928. Paper, M. 6.50.
- Shewan (A.) *Lusus Homericus.* Pp. 55. Oxford: Blackwell, 1928. Boards, 2s. 6d. net.
- Walzel (O.) *Handbuch der Literaturwissenschaft. Lieferungen 96, 102, 109: A. Kappelmacher, Röm. Literatur, Heft 4; E. Bethe, Griech. Literatur, Heft 11, 12. Wildpark-Potsdam: 'Athenaion,' 1928.*
- Weidenbach (H.) *Das Geheimnis der schweren Basis: Das Jery slavenicum!* Pp. 31. Heidelberg: C. Winter, 1928. Paper, M. 2.
- Zimmern (A.) *Solon and Croesus, and other Greek Essays.* Pp. vii+199. London: Milford, 1928. Cloth, 7s. 6d. net.

INDEX

I.—GENERAL INDEX.

- Abbott and Johnson's *Municipal Administration in the Roman Empire*, noticed, 83
 Alexander on the Indian North-West Frontier, 50
 Allen (J. T.), note on song-birds in Greek Literature, 5
 Anderson (W. E.), notice of Mooney's *Index to Lucan*, 84; notice of Nixon's *Martial and the Modern Epigram*, 43; notice of Raby's *Christian-Latin Poetry*, 88; notice of Rollfuss's *Des Qu. Horatius Flaccus Carmina in ihrem kunstvollen Strophenaufbau*, 42; notice of Scott's *The Grand Style in the Satires of Juvenal*, 43
 Aquilo, the black wind, 20
 Armytage's *Christianity in the Roman World*, noticed, 89
 Arnim's *Philonis Byzantini Index*, noticed, 41
 Ascræ, 62
 Ashby's *Roman Campagna in Classical Times*, noticed, 36
 Atkinson (D.), a new Roman Governor of Provincia Britannia, 11; notice of Abbott and Johnson's *Municipal Administration in the Roman Empire*, 83; notice of Bartoccini's *Guida di Lepcis and Guida di Sabratha*, 152; notice of Calza's *Il Teatro Romano di Ostia*, 152; notice of Chapot's *Le Monde Romain*, 82; notice of Marsh's *The Founding of the Roman Empire*, second edition, 91
 Babbitt's *Plutarch's Moralia* (Loeb Library), noticed, 130
 Back's *Körper und Rhythmus*, noticed, 90
 Bacon (J. E.), three notes on Aeschylus, *Prometheus Vincit*, 115
 Bailey (C.), notice of Drew's *Allegory of the Aeneid*, 31; notice of Munro's *Lucretius*, Vol. II, 135; notice of Pascal's *Lucretio*, Book I, 135
 Baker's *Sulla the Fortunate*, noticed, 30
 Barker (E.), notice of Heintzeler's *Das Bild des Tyrannen bei Platon*, 204
 Barrow's *Slavery in the Roman Empire*, noticed, 141
 Bartoccini's *Guida di Lepcis and Guida di Sabratha*, noticed, 152
 Bassett (S. E.), note on αἰνέεσθαι, Plato, *Ap.* 27A, 21B, 58
 Beare (W.), Plautus, *M.G.* 843, 20; Plautus and his public, 106; the priority of the *Mercator*, 214
 Beasley (J. D.), a Greek epigram, 58; notice of Back's *Körper und Rhythmus*, 90
 Bell (H. I.), notice of Steinacker's *Die antiken Grundlagen der frühmittelalterlichen Privaturkunde*, 199
 Bell's *Concise Latin Course*, new Part II, noticed, 68
 Bevan (E.), Plato, *Timæus* 37C, 170
 Bevan's *Egypt under the Ptolemaic Dynasty*, noticed, 79; *Later Greek Religion*, noticed, 194
 Beyer's *Die Katakombenwelt*, noticed, 242
Bibliotheca Philologica Classica, Band 52, noticed, 91
 Blakeney's *Cyprian, de Unitate Ecclesiae*, noticed, 241
 BOOKS RECEIVED, 47, 94, 157, 207, 246
 Bornecque and Rabaud's *Cicéron (Verrines II. 4)*, noticed, 42
 Borucki's *Seneca philosophus*, etc., noticed, 42
 Bowra (C. M.), Horace, *Odes IV. 12*, 165; notice of Lobel's *Ἀλλὰ οὐ Μέλῳ*, 23; notice of Milne's *Catalogue of the Literary Papyri in the British Museum*, 131; notice of *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, Part XVII, 131
 Box (H.), notice of Duncan's *Phædo*, 147; notice of Harvard's *The Epinomis of Plato*, 148
 Braithwaite's *C. Suetoni Tranquilli Divus Vespasianus*, noticed, 150
 Brakman's *Pervigilium Veneris*, noticed, 242
 Braunholtz (G. E. K.), notice of *Bibliotheca Philologica Classica*, Band 52, 91; notice of Hallam's *Horace at Tibur and the Sabine Farm*, 150
 Brett's *Psychology Ancient and Modern* (Our Debt to Greece and Rome), noticed, 226
 Brooke (Z. N.), notice of Schwahn's *Laurentii Vallæ de Constantini donatione declamatio*, 154
 Buck's *Greek Dialects*, noticed, 229
 Buonamici and Modona's *Guide to Etruscan Antiquities*, noticed, 240
 Burck's *De Vergilii Georgicon Partibus Iussivis*, noticed, 87
 Burnet (J.), obituary notice of, 113
 Burns' (A. R.) *Money and Monetary Policy in Early Times*, noticed, 153
 Burns' (R. E. and A. E.) *Easy Latin for Beginners*, noticed, 202
 Burrage's *The Ithaca of the Odyssey*, noticed, 177
 Bury (E. G.), notice of Ross's *Works of Aristotle translated into English*, Vol. VIII, 204
 Busbecq's *Turkish Letters*, noticed, 114
 Butler (H. E.), notice of Frank's *Caullus and Horace*, 196; notice of Haight's *Apuleius and his Influence*, 87; notice of Ingersoll's *The Rome of Horace*, 196
 Calder (W. M.), letters of Busbecq, 114; notice of Beyer's *Die Katakombenwelt*, 242; notice of Deferari's *St. Basil: The Letters* (Loeb Library), Vol. II, 149; notice of Lawlor and Oulton's *Eusebius*, Vol. I, 44; notice of Ramsay's *Asiatic Elements in Greek Civilisation*, 221; notice of Rostovtzeff's *History of the Ancient World*, 174
 Calhoun and Delamere's *A Working Bibliography of Greek Law*, noticed, 191
 Calonghi's *Albii Tibulli Aliorumque Carminum Libri IV*, noticed, 197
 Calza's *Il Teatro Romano di Ostia*, noticed, 152
 Cambridge Ancient History, The, Vols. V, VI, noticed, 183
 Cameron (A.), *Obnubilatum ito*, and Livy XLV. 12, 127
 Campbell (S. G.), notice of Buck's *Greek Dialects*, 229
 Carlsson's *Die Überlieferung der Seneca- Tragödien*, noticed, 150
 Cary (M.), notice of Baker's *Sulla the Fortunate*, 30; notice of Barrow's *Slavery in the Roman Empire*, 141; notice of Skalet's *Ancient Sicily*, 238; notice of Stuart's *Epochs of Greek and Roman Biography*, 232; notice of Uxkull-Gyllenband's *Plutarch*, 30
 Cary's (E.) *Dio* (Loeb Library), Vols. VIII and IX, noticed, 130
 Cary's (M.) *Documentary Sources of Greek History*, noticed, 134
 Castiglioni's *Il Problema della Originalità romana*, noticed, 138
Catalogue des manuscrits alchimiques grecs, Vol. II, noticed, 89
 Chambry's *Esopé: Fables*, noticed, 240
 Chapot's *Le Monde Romain*, noticed, 82
 Charlesworth (M. P.), notice of Braithwaite's *Suetoni Vespasianus*, 150; notice of Henderson's *Five Roman Emperors*, 37
 Chrimes (K. M. T.), notice of Knorrhinga's *Emporos: Data on Trade and Traders in Greek Literature*, 228
 Claim of Antiquity, The, noticed, 3
 clan, 241
 Clark's *Study of the 'Iliad' in translation*, noticed, 128

- Classical Association, meeting of the, 1
 Classical Association of South Africa, 113
 Classical Association of Victoria, 50
Classical Weekly summarised, 45, 92, 154
 Clemen's *Fontes Historiae Religionis Germanae*, noticed, 244
 Colin's *Les Antiquités romaines de la Rhénanie*, noticed, 238
 Collart's *Les Papyrus Bouriant*, noticed, 149
 Collingwood (R. G.), notice of Colin's *Les Antiquités romaines de la Rhénanie*, 238; notice of Corder's *Roman Pottery at Crambeck*, 243; notice of Hannah's *Voadica*, 151; notice of Hopkinson's *Roman Fort at Ribchester* (third edition), 244
Commentationes Philologicae in honorem I. A. Heikel, noticed, 90
 Conley's *The First English Translations of the Classics*, noticed, 45
 Conway (R. S.), notice of Randall-MacIver's *The Etruscans*, 233
 Corder's *Roman Pottery at Crambeck*, noticed, 243
Corpus Medicorum Graecorum, noticed, 29
 CORRESPONDENCE, 47, 94, 157
 Craze (J. F.), version from *The Yeomen of the Guard*, 168
 Craig's *Jovialis and the Callipian Text of Terence*, noticed, 42
 Cranevelt's correspondence, noticed, 114
 Crees (J. H. E.), notice of Gillies' *Argonautica of Apollonius Rhodius, Book III*, 191
 Crees and Wordsworth's *Apollonius Rhodius: The Story of Medea*, noticed, 69
 Croiset's *Hellenic Civilisation*, noticed, 133
 Dalton's *History of the Franks* (Gregory of Tours), noticed, 89
 Davies (O.), *Ascrea*, 62
 Davis' *A Pioneer Latin Unseen Book*, noticed, 67
 Dawson (H. S.), two passages in the *Agamemnon*, 53
 Dawson's *Age of the Gods*, noticed, 172
 Deas (H. T.), notice of Hude's *Scholia in Thucydidem*, 145
 Deferrari's *St. Basil: The Letters* (Loeb Library), Vol. II, noticed, 149
 della Valle's *Il Canto Bucolico in Sicilia*, noticed, 239
 de Regibus' *Livy*, Book XXXVII, noticed, 140
 Dicker (M. E.), note on Theocritus X. 26 ff., 170
 Diesendruck's *Struktur und Charakter des Platonischen Phaidros*, noticed, 181
 Dobson (J. F.), notice of Edmonds' *Lyra Graeca*, Vol. III, 128; notice of Forster's *Isaeus* (Loeb Library), 189; notice of Laistner's *Isocrates, De Pace and Philippus*, 189; notice of Martin and de Budé's *Eschine* Vol. I, 189, Vol. II, 239
 Doherty's *Demosthenes* (three speeches), noticed, 68
 Dramatic Irony in Sophoclean Tragedy, 209
 Drew (D. L.), *Aristophanes' Pax* 695-699, 56
 Drew's *Allegory of the Aeneid*, noticed, 31
 Duff (F. W.), notice of Seckel and Kuebler's *Iurisprudencia Anteustiniana*, II, 2, 154
 Duncan's *Phaedo*, noticed, 147
 Duthie's *Readings from Horace*, noticed, 201; *Readings from Livy*, noticed, 68
 Eckstein's *Griechische Metrik*, noticed, 41
 Edmonds' *Lyra Graeca*, Vol. III, noticed, 128
 Edwards (W. M.), *Horace, Satires I. 4-6 ff.*, 9
 Etruscan Congress, 3
 Evans (A. J.), the Fitzwilliam goddess, 61
 Fairclough's *Horace: Satires, Epistles and Ars Poetica*, noticed, 194
 Farrington's *Primum Graius Homo*, noticed, 4
 Fecht's *Theodosii de habitacionibus liber, de diebus et noctibus libri duo*, noticed, 239
 Field (G. C.), notice of Taylor's *Plato: the Man and his Work*, 28
 Fitzwilliam goddess, the, 61
 Fleig and Wohleb's *Römische Metrik*, noticed, 41
 Fletcher (G. B. A.), was Persius not a 'micher'? 167; notice of Hodge's *Cicero: Pro Lege Manilia*, etc. (Loeb Library), 236
 Focke's *Herodot als Historiker*, noticed, 86
 Forster (E. S.), notice of Thumb's *Grammatik der Neugriechischen Volkssprache*, second edition, 205; notice of Kalitsunakis' *Grammatik der Neugriechischen Schriftsprache*, 153; notice of de Ridder and Deonna's *Art in Greece*, 72; notice of Ure's *Pottery from Rhitsona*, 73
 Forster's *Isaeus* (Loeb Library), noticed, 189
 Frank's *Catullus and Horace*, noticed, 196
 Fraser (J.), notice of Buonamici and Modona's *Guide to Etruscan Antiquities*, 240; notice of *Commentationes Philologicae in honorem I. A. Heikel*, 90; notice of Pritzwald's *Sprache und Persönlichkeit*, 90; notice of Stolz-Schmalz: *Latineische Grammatik*, fifth edition (Leumann and Hofmann), 232; notice of 'Ulisse,' *Clan non è Filius*, 241
 Friedländer's *Platon*, noticed, 146
 Gardiner (E. N.), notice of Ringwood's *Local Greek Festivals*, 74
 Gardiner's *Virgil: Eclogues and Georgics*, noticed, 68
 Gardner (E. A.), notice of Johnson's *Lysippos*, 227
 Gardner (R.), notice of Ashby's *Roman Campagna in Classical Times*, 36
 Gardner's *A Latin Book for Beginners*, noticed, 67
 Gaselee (S.), notice of Brakman's *Pervigilium Veneris*, 242; notice of Conley's *The First English Translations of the Classics*, 45; notice of Haskins' *Renaissance of the Twelfth Century*, 40; notice of Scholderer's *Greek Printing Types, 1465-1927*, 45; notice of Waddell's *Wandering Scholars*, 40
 Giglioli's *Metrica di Callimaco e quella di Propertio*, noticed, 86; *Poesia Propertiana*, noticed, 87
 Gillies' *Argonautica of Apollonius Rhodius, Book III*, noticed, 191
 Glover (M. R.), some interpretations of Greek plays, 97
 Gomme (A. W.), notice of Oppermann's *Ἀθηναίων Πολιτεία*, 224; notice of Tarn's *Hellenistic Civilisation*, 75; notice of *The Cambridge Ancient History*, V, VI, 183
 Gow (A. S. F.), notice of della Valle's *Il Canto Bucolico*, 239; notice of Norlin's *Integrity in Education and Other Papers*, 45
 Grenfell (B. P.), 49
 Groen's *Lexicon Anthimeum*, noticed, 89
 Grundy (W. W.), notice of Carlsson's *Die Überlieferung der Seneca-Tragödien*, 150; notice of Fairclough's *Horace: Satires, Epistles and Ars Poetica*, 194; notice of Giglioli's *Metrica di Callimaco e quella di Propertio*, 86; notice of Weinreich's *Catull*, 86; notice of Giglioli's *Poesia Propertiana*, 87; notice of Klotz's *Kommentar zum Bellum Hispaniense*, 149; notice of Wolff's *Taciti Historiarum libri*, Vol. II, second edition, 206
 Gulick's *Athenaeus* (Loeb Library), Vol. I, noticed, 130
 Hackforth (R.), notice of Diesendruck's *Struktur und Charakter des Platonischen Phaidros*, 181; notice of Paoli's *Platone: la Repubblica*, 204
 Haight's *Apuleius and his Influence*, noticed, 87
 Hallam (G. H.), *Horace's Tiburtine Villa*, 125
 Hallam's *Horace at Tibur and the Sabine Farm*, noticed, 150
 Halliday (W. B.), *Livy XLV. 12. 172*; the magical vine of Nysa and the Dionysiac wine miracle, 19; notice of Rose's *Handbook of Greek Mythology*, 222
 Halliday's *Greek and Roman Folklore*, noticed, 69
 Handford's *Xenophon, Anab. III and IV*, noticed, 200
 Hannah's *Voadica*, noticed, 151
 Hardy's *Shorter Iliad*, noticed, 200

Harrison (E.), notice of Babbitt's *Plutarch's Moralia* (Loeb Library), Vol. I, 130; notice of Cary's *Dio* (Loeb Library), Vols. VIII and IX, 130; notice of Eckstein, Fleig and Wohleb's *Antike Metrik für den Schulgebrauch*, 41; notice of Gulick's *Athenaeus* (Loeb Library), Vol. I, 130; notice of Liddell and Scott, Parts 2 and 3, 91; notice of Lindskog and Ziegler's *Plutarchi Vitae Parallelae*, III, ii, 192; notice of Melber's *Dio Cassius*, Vol. III, 130; notice of Paton's *Polybius* (Loeb Library), Vols. V-VI, 130

Harward's *The Epinomis of Plato*, noticed, 147

Haskins' Renaissance of the Twelfth Century, noticed, 40

Hearnshaw (L. S.), *Lucretius II*, 515-6, 63

Heath (T. L.), notice of Fecht's *Theodosii de habitationibus liber, de diebus et noctibus libri duo*, 239; notice of Heiberg's *Theodosius, Sphaerica*, 239

Heiberg's Theodosius, Sphaerica, noticed, 239

Heintzeler's Das Bild des Tyrannen bei Platon, noticed, 204

Henderson's Five Roman Emperors, noticed, 37

Highbarger's Ancient Megara, noticed, 22

Hignett's Caesar's Gallic War, Books I-III, noticed, 68

hinneleus, 127

Hodge's Cicero : Pro Lege Manilia, etc. (Loeb Library), noticed, 236

Hohl's Scriptores Historiae Augustae, noticed, 151

Höhne's Die Geschichte des Sallusttextes, noticed, 236

Holmes' The Architect of the Roman Empire, noticed, 137

homo and vir, 111

Hopkinson's Roman Fort at Ribchester, third edition, noticed, 244

Horace's Tiburtine Villa, 125

Housman (A. E.), *Oxyrhynchus Papyri XVII*, 2078, 9; the first editor of *Lucretius*, 122 (cf. 215); notice of Morel's *Fragmenta Postarum Latinorum*, 77; notice of Perret's *La transmission du texte de Juvénal*, 43

How to catch cuttlefish, 14

Hude's Scholia in Thucydidem, noticed, 145

Hunt (A. S.), a note on the new *Callimachus*, 6; notice of *Salonius' Zur Sprache der griechischen Papyrusbrieft*, Vol. I, 148

Ilberg's Sorani Gynaeciorum libri IV, noticed, 87

Ingersoll's The Rome of Horace, noticed, 196

irony in Sophocles, 209

Jenkins (C.), notice of Souter's *Earliest Latin Commentaries on the Epistles of St. Paul*, 39

Johnson (S. K.), notes on the *Philoctetes*, 55; some aspects of dramatic irony in Sophoclean tragedy, 209; notice of Höhne's *Die Geschichte des Sallusttextes*, 236; notice of de Regibus' *Levy*, Book XXXVII, 140; notice of Ullmann's *La Technique des Discours dans Salluste, Tite Live et Tacite*, 198

Johnson's Lysippos, noticed, 227

Johnstone's Hippolytus, noticed, 64

Jones (W. H. S.), notice of the Teubner Medical Corpus, 29

Kaerst's Geschichte des Hellenismus, Vol. I, third edition, noticed, 148

Kalb's S. Augustini De Civitate Dei, noticed, 242

Kalinka's Hellenica Oxyrhynchica, noticed, 182

Kalitsunakis' Grammatik der Neugriechischen Schriftsprache, noticed, 153

Kaniecka's Vita S. Ambrosii, noticed, 241

Kerényi's Die Griechisch-Orientalische Romanliteratur in religionsgeschichtlicher Beleuchtung, noticed, 230

Kitto (H. D. F.), the rhythms of Pindar, 51

Klotz's Kommentar zum Bellum Hispaniense, noticed, 149

Kluge's P. Optatianus Porphyrii Carmina, noticed, 44

Knorringa's Emporers: Data on Trade and Traders in Greek Literature, noticed, 228

Knor (A. D.), *Herodes II*, 6-8, 163

Kock's Aristophanes, Vol. 4 (The Birds), noticed, 129

Laistner (M. L. W.), notice of Norlin's *Isocrates* (Loeb Library), 223

Laistner's Isocrates, De Pace and Philippus, noticed, 189

Lamb (W. R. M.), notice of Tarrant's *Hippias Maior*, 222

Lamb's Plato (Loeb Library), Vol. VIII, noticed, 147

Laqueur's Epigraphische Untersuchungen zu den griechischen Volksbeschlüssen, noticed, 204

Lawlor and Oulton's Eusebius, Vol. I, noticed, 44

Levens (E. G. O.), note on Metellus Celer's letter to Cicero, 171

Liddell and Scott, new edition, Parts 2 and 3, noticed, 91

Liechtenhan's Anthimi De Observatione Ciborum ep., noticed, 244

Lilliedahl's Florusstudien, noticed, 241

Lindsay (W. M.), *Aquilo*, the Black Wind, 20; Terence, *Eun.* 230, 63; Terence, *Phorm.* 330, 62

Lindsay's Palaeographia Latina V, noticed, 39

Lindskog and Ziegler's Plutarchi Vitae Parallelae, III ii, noticed, 192

Lister (H.), notice of some class-books, 67

Livingstone's The Mission of Greece, noticed, 219

Lobel's Ἀλλὰ γὰρ Μέλῳ, noticed, 23

Louvain, University Library of, 114

Lowe (E. A.), notice of Lindsay's *Palaeographia Latina V*, 39

Mackail (J. W.), notice of Macnaghten's *Virgil's Secret and other Plays*, 81; notice of Wight Duff's *Silver Age*, 34

Macnaghten's Antigone, noticed, 64; *Virgil's Secret and other Plays*, noticed, 81

Maguinness (W. S.), *Horace Ep. I. 6, 5-8*, 219

Marchant (E. C.), *Tacitus, Annals IV. 12*, 217

Marsh's The Founding of the Roman Empire, second edition, noticed, 91

Martin's Aspects of Roman Life, noticed, 202

Martin and de Budé's Eschines, Vol. I, noticed, 189; Vol. II, noticed, 239

Mattingly's Roman Coins, noticed, 142; *The Pirates*, noticed, 200

McGuire's S. Ambrosii De Nabuthae, noticed, 151

McKenzie (E.), notice of Arnim's *Philonis Byzantini Index*, 41

Melber's Dio Cassius, Vol. III, noticed, 130

Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome, Vol. VI, noticed, 243

Mendell's Prometheus Bound and Prometheus Unbound, noticed, 64

Mey's Das Schlachtfeld vor Troja, noticed, 41

Milne's (H. J.) Catalogue of the Literary Papyri in the British Museum, noticed, 131

Milne's (J. M.) Junior Latin Tests, noticed, 203

Minns (E. H.), notice of Palata's *Horae Subsecivae*, 153; notice of Párvan's *Dacia*, 243; notice of Salac and Škorpil's *Arch. Monuments from East Bulgaria*, 243

Mitchison's Black Sparta, noticed, 203

Mooney's Index to Lucan, noticed, 84

Morel's Fragmenta Postarum Latinorum, noticed, 77

Mountford (J. F.), notice of Perrett's *Some Questions of Musical Theory*, III, IV, 193

Mozley's Statius (Loeb Library), noticed, 237

Mummius Sisenna (P.), 14

Munro's Lucretius, Vol. II., noticed, 135

Musée Belge summarised, 155

Myres (J. L.), notice of Dawson's *The Age of the Gods*, 172; notice of Thorndike's *A Short History of Civilization*, 172

Nairn (J. A.), version from La Fontaine, 49

Nairn's Greek Prose Composition, noticed, 4

Neue Wege zur Antike, Hefte 2-4, noticed, 138

Newman's De Gente Romana, noticed, 67

Nixon's Martial and the Modern Epigram, noticed, 43

Noek (A. D.), notice of Bevan's *Later Greek Religion*, 194; notice of *Catalogue des manuscrits alchimiques grecs*, Vol. II, 89; notice of Collart's *Les Papyrus Bouriant*, 149

- Norlin's *Integrity in Education and Other Papers*, noticed, 45; *Isocrates* (Loeb Library), noticed, 223
- Obovolutum ito*, 127
- Ohl's *The Enigmas of Symphosius*, noticed, 242
- Oldfather's *Contributions towards a Bibliography of Epictetus*, noticed, 240
- Onians (R. B.), *Lucretius V.* 1341-9, 215
- Oppermann's *Ἀθηναίων Πολιτεία*, noticed, 224
- Orth's *Nemesios von Emesa: Anthropologie*, noticed, 240
- Owen (A. S.), notice of some verse translations, 64
- Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, Part XVII, noticed, 131
- Palata's *Horae Subsecivae*, noticed, 153
- Paoli's *Platone: la Repubblica*, noticed, 204
- Parke (H. W.), *Polyaenus VI.* 18 and AAIBANTEΣ, 120; when was Charidemus made an Athenian citizen? 170
- Párvan's *Dacia*, noticed, 243
- Pascal's *Lucrezio*, Book I, noticed, 135
- Paton's *Polybius* (Loeb Library), Vols. V and VI, noticed, 130
- Peck (A. L.), *Composition*, 3; notice of Ilberg's *Sorani Gynaeciorum libri IV*, 87
- Peet (T. E.), notice of Randall-MacIver's *Iron Age in Italy*, 80; notice of Spiegelberg's *Herodotus' Account of Egypt*, 145
- Perret's *La transmission du texte de Juvénal*, noticed, 43
- Perrett's *Some Questions of Musical Theory*, III, IV, noticed, 193
- Petersson's *De Epitoma Iustini*, noticed, 43
- Philologische Wochenschrift* summarised, 46, 92, 156, 206, 245
- Pickard-Cambridge (A. W.), notice of Séchan's *Études sur la Tragédie grecque*, and *Le Dévouement d'Alceste*, 25
- Platnauer (M.), notice of Wallace's *Color in Homer and in Ancient Art*, 175
- Porzig's *Die attische Tragödie des Aischylos*, noticed, 85
- Postgate (J. P.), 49
- Poynton (J. B.), notice of Bornecque and Rabaud's *Cicéron* (Verrines, II. 4), 42
- Poynton's (A. B.) *Greek oration*, 2
- Price's *Cicero in Asia*, noticed, 201
- Pritzwald's *Sprache und Persönlichkeit*, noticed, 90
- Raby's *Christian-Latin Poetry*, noticed, 88
- Rackham (H.), notes on the Nicomachean Ethics, 6
- Ramsay's *Asianic Elements in Greek Civilisation*, noticed, 221
- Randall-MacIver's *Iron Age in Italy*, noticed, 80; *The Etruscans*, noticed, 233
- Rattenbury (R. M.), *Charito I.* 3, 5, 219
- Rendall's *Latin Prose Revision*, noticed, 202
- Rennie (W.), notice of Kock's *Aristophanes*, Vol. 4 (The Birds), 129
- Richardson's *Τὰ Ἰνδικά*, noticed, 5
- Ridder (de) and Deonna's *Art in Greece*, noticed, 72
- Ridgeway, Sir W., 49
- Ringwood's *Local Greek Festivals*, noticed, 74
- Ritchie's *The Plays of Terence*, noticed, 64
- Robertson (D. S.), *Juvenal VIII.* 241, 60; notice of Kerényi's *Die Griechisch-Orientalische Romanliteratur in religionsgeschichtlicher Beleuchtung*, 230; notice of *Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome*, Vol. VI, 243; notice of Mitchison's *Black Sparta*, 203; notice of Waddell's *Menander*, 27; notice of Wade-Gery and Bowra's *Pindar: Pythian Odes*, 177; notice of Wilamowitz-Moellendorf's *Lysistrata*, 26
- Robinson (E. S. G.), notice of Burns' *Money in Early Times*, 153
- Robson (E. I.), *Virgil, Eclogue IV.* 18-20, 123
- Rodd's *Homer's Ithaka*, noticed, 21
- Rollfuss's *Des Qu. Horatius Flaccus Carmina in ihrem kunstvollen Strophenbau*, noticed, 42
- Rose (H. J.), a new title of Fortuna? 171; the River of Tears, 171; *Thucydides VI.* 64, 1, 169; notice of Clemen's *Fontes Historiae Religionis Germanae*, 244; notice of Halliday's *Greek and Roman Folklore*, 69; notice of Schwenn's *Gebet und Opfer*, 90
- Rose's *Handbook of Greek Mythology*, noticed, 222
- Ross's *Works of Aristotle translated into English*, Vol. VIII, noticed, 204
- Rostovtzeff's *History of the Ancient World*, noticed, 174
- Salač and Škorpiľ's *Archaeological Monuments of East Bulgaria*, noticed, 243
- Salonius' *Die Griechen und das Griechische in Petrons Cena Trimalchionis*, noticed, 42; *Zur Sprache der griechischen Papyrusbriefe*, Vol. I, noticed, 148
- Salt's *Dido and Aeneas*, noticed, 64
- Sandbach (F. H.), *Virgil, Georg. II.* 277, 59; notice of Burck's *De Vergili Georgicon Partibus Iussius*, 87; notice of Oldfather's *Contributions towards a Bibliography of Epictetus*, 240; notice of Orth's *Nemesios von Emesa: Anthropologie*, 240
- Sayce (A. H.), *Kybelē and Gallos in the Hittite texts*, 161
- Schlachter's *Globus*, noticed, 33
- Scholderer's *Greek Printing Types, 1465-1927*, noticed, 45
- Schwahn's *Laurentii Vallae de Constantini donatione declamatio*, noticed, 154
- Schwenn's *Gebet und Opfer*, noticed, 90
- Scoon's *Greek Philosophy before Plato*, noticed, 180
- Scott's *The Grand Style in the Satires of Juvenal*, noticed, 43
- Séchan's *Études sur la Tragédie grecque*, and *Le Dévouement d'Alceste*, noticed, 25
- Seckel and Kuebler's *Iurisprudentia Anteustiniana*, II, 2, noticed, 154
- Sedgwick (W. B.), notice of Salonius' *Die Griechen und das Griechische in Petrons Cena Trimalchionis*, 42
- Sheppard (J. T.), notice of Clark's *Study of the 'Iliad'*, 128; notice of Porzig's *Aischylos*, 85; notice of Snell's *Aischylos und das Handeln im Drama*, 178; notice of Stumpo's *Il Deus ex Machina nella Tragedia Greca*, 203
- Sheppard's translation of *Electra and Peace*, noticed, 64
- Shewan (A.), notice of Burrage's *The Ithaca of the Odyssey*, 177; notice of Mey's *Das Schlachtfeld vor Troja*, 41; notice of Rodd's *Homer's Ithaka*, 21
- Skalet's *Ancient Sicyon*, noticed, 238
- Smiley (M. T.), notice of de Vries' *Pallaks*, 145
- Smith (N.), notice of Livingstone's *The Mission of Greece*, 219
- Snell's *Aischylos und das Handeln im Drama*, noticed, 178
- Song-birds in Greek literature, 5
- Sonnenschein's *The Soul of Grammar*, noticed, 144
- Souter (A.), notice of Armytage's *Christianity in the Roman World*, 89; notice of Blakeney's *Cyprian, de Unitate Ecclesiae*, 241; notice of Borucki's *Seneca philosophus*, etc., 42; notice of Craig's *Jovialis and the Calliopian Text of Terence*, 42; notice of Dalton's *History of the Franks* (Gregory of Tours), 89; notice of Groen's *Lexicon Anthimeum*, 89; notice of Kani-ecka's *Vita S. Ambrosii*, 241; notice of Kluge's *P. Optatiani Porphyrii Carmina*, 44; notice of Liechtenhan *Anthimi De Observatione Ciborum, epistula*, 244; notice of Lilliedahl's *Florusstudien*, 241; notice of McGuire's *S. Ambrosii De Nabuthae*, 151; notice of Ohl's *The Enigmas of Symphosius*, 242; notice of Petersson's *De Epitoma Iustini*, 43; notice of Stein's *Encomium of St. Gregory*, 205; notice of Svennung's *Palladii Rutilii Opus Agriculturae*, 44
- Souter's *Latin Commentaries on the Epistles of St. Paul*, noticed, 39
- Spiegelberg's *Herodotus' Account of Egypt*, noticed, 145
- Stein's (Sir A.) *Alexander's Campaign on the Indian North-West Frontier*, noticed, 50
- Stein's (J. A.) *Encomium of St. Gregory*, noticed, 205
- Steinacker's *Die antiken Grundlagen der frühmittelalterlichen Privaturkunde*, noticed, 199

Stevenson (G. H.), notice of Holmes' *The Architect of the Roman Empire*, 137
Stewart (H.), notice of Calonghi's *Albii Tibulli Alorumque Carminum Libri IV.*, 197; notice of Mozley's *Statius* (Loeb Library), 237
Stolz-Schmalz: Lateinische Grammatik, fifth edition, noticed, 232
Stuart's Epochs of Greek and Roman Biography, noticed, 232
Stuart Jones (H.), notice of Hohl's *Scriptores Historiae Augustae*, 151
Stuart Jones' Catalogue of the Ancient Sculptures in the Municipal Collections of Rome, noticed, 70
Stumpo's *Il Deus ex Machina nella Tragedia Greca*, noticed, 203
SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS, 45, 92, 154, 206, 245
Svennung's *Palladii Rutilii Opus Agriculturae, Liber XIV*, noticed, 44
Tarn (W. W.), notice of Bevan's *Egypt under the Ptolemaic Dynasty*, 79; notice of Kaerst's *Geschichte des Hellenismus*, Vol. I, third edition, 148; notice of Stein's *Alexander's Campaign on the Indian North-West Frontier*, 50
Tarn's Hellenistic Civilisation, noticed, 75
Tarrant's *Hippias Maior*, noticed, 222
Tate (J.), was Persius a 'micher'? 63; notice of Wehrli's *Zur Geschichte der allegorischen Deutung Homers im Altertum*, 203
Taylor (A. E.), notice of Brett's *Psychology Ancient and Modern (Our Debt to Greece and Rome)*, 226; notice of Friedländer's *Platon*, 146; notice of Lamb's *Plato* (Loeb Library), Vol. VIII, 147; notice of Scoon's *Greek Philosophy before Plato*, 180; notice of Walsdorff's *Die antiken Urteile über Platons Stil*, 153
Taylor (M. E. J.), Aeschylus, *Agam.* 1285, 19
Taylor's *Plato: the Man and his Work*, noticed, 28
Tennant's *Bacchanals*, noticed, 64
Theobald's *Physiologus* (tr. Rendall), noticed, 245
Thompson (D'Arcy W.), how to catch cuttlefish, 14; notice of Theobald's *Physiologus* (tr. Rendall), 245
Thomson (J. O.), Juvenal III. 186-9, 172
Thorndike's *A Short History of Civilization*, noticed, 172
Thumb's *Grammatik der Neugriechischen Volkssprache*, second edition, noticed, 205
Tod (M. N.), notice of Calhoun and Delamere's *A Working Bibliography of Greek Law*, 191; notice of Laqueur's *Epigraphische Untersuchungen zu den griechischen Volksbeschlüssen*, 204
Toynbee (J.), notice of Mattingley's *Roman Coins*, 142
 'Ulisse,' *Clan non è Filius*, noticed, 241
Ullmann's *La Technique des Discours dans Salluste, Tite Live et Tacite*, noticed, 198

Ure (P. N.), notice of Croiset's *Hellenic Civilisation*, 133
Ure's *Pottery from Rhitsona*, noticed, 73
Urkull-Gyllenband's *Plutarch*, noticed, 30
Vesey (W. T.), *Virum te putabo, hominem non putabo*, 111
Vreese's (de) *Petron 39 und die Astrologie*, noticed, 33
Vries's (de) *Pallake*, noticed, 145
Wace (A. J. B.), notice of Stuart Jones' *Catalogue of the Ancient Sculptures in the Municipal Museums of Rome*, 70; notice of Walston's *Alcámenes and Notes on Greek Sculpture*, 70
Waddell (W. G.), notice of Chambry's *Esopé: Fables*, 240; notice of some class-books, 200
Waddell's (H.) *Wandering Scholars*, noticed, 40
Waddell's (W. G.) *Menander*, noticed, 27
Wade-Gery (H. T.), notice of Highbarger's *Ancient Megara*, 22
Wade-Gery and Bowra's *Pindar: Pythian Odes*, noticed, 177
Walker (E. M.), notice of Cary's *Documentary Sources of Greek History*, 134; notice of Kalinka's *Hellenica Oxyrhynchia*, 182
Wallace's *Color in Homer and in Ancient Art*, noticed, 175
Walsdorff's *Die antiken Urteile über Platons Stil*, noticed, 153
Walston's *Alcámenes and Notes on Greek Sculpture*, noticed, 70
Watson (E. W.), notice of Kalb's *S. Augustini De Civitate Dei*, 242
Way's *Aristophanes*, Vol. I, noticed, 64
Webb (E. J.), notice of Schlachter's *Globus*, 33; notice of Vreese's *Petron 39 und die Astrologie*, 33
Wehrli's *Zur Geschichte der allegorischen Deutung Homers im Altertum*, noticed, 203
Weinreich's *Die Distichen des Catull*, noticed, 86
Wells (J.), notice of Focke's *Herodot als Historiker*, 86
Whatmough (J.), Latin *hinnuleus* again, 127
Wight Duff (J.), notice of Castiglioni's *Il Problema della Originalità romana*, 138; notice of *Neue Wege zur Antike*, Hefte 2-4, 138
Wight Duff's *Literary History of Rome in the Silver Age*, noticed, 34
Wilamowitz-Moellendorf's *Lysistrata*, noticed, 26; celebration of eightieth birthday, 209
Williamson (H.), notice of Sonnenschein's *The Soul of Grammar*, 144
Wolfe's *Others Abide*, noticed, 64
Wolff's *Taciti Historiarum libri*, Vol. II, second edition, noticed, 206
Wyllie (J. M.), the women's quarters in the palace of Odysseus, 163

II.—INDEX LOCORUM.

Aelian *N.A.* xii. 43: 18
 Aeschylus *Ag.* 414-415: 55; 438-444: 53; 1285: 19.
P.V., various passages: 115 ff.
 Alcaeus *Inc. Lib.* 39, 45: 23
 Anacreon *fr.* 36: 23
 Aristophanes *Birds* 686 f.: 117; various passages: 129-30. *Lys.* 1083: 26. *Peace* 695-9: 56
 Aristotle *1st Ab.* 1101, various passages: 224 ff. *Eth. Nic.*, various passages: 6, 7. *H.A.* V. 550b, 7: 17.
Polit. 1267a, 39: 169. *Rhet.* III. 1412a, 23: 58
 Arrian *IV.* 21. 3-5: 50
 Athenaeus *1c*, 126, 56: 130 f.
 Callimachus *fr.* 286 and 323: 6
 Charito *I.* 3. 5: 219

Cicero *ad Att.* IV. 15. 2, XIII. 52. 2: 112. *ad Fam.* V. 1-2: 171; V. 17. 3: 112. *ad Q.F.* II. 9. 3: 111.
Tusc. II. 53: 112
 Curtius *VIII.* 2. 24: 50
 Demosthenes *XIV.* 24, *XIX.* 328: 58; *XXIII.* 151: 170; *XLII.* 25: 164. *C. Aristocr.* 53: 145
 Dio Cassius, various passages of *LVI.-LXIII.*: 130
 Diodorus *IV.* 3: 19b
 Euripides *Ion* 843, 979: 99. *Supp.* 450: 132. *Troades*, various passages: 120
 Eustathius 882. 38: 19b
 Herodes *II.* 6-8: 163
 Hesiod *O.D.* 506, 518: 62
 Homer *Od.* IX. 515-6: 117; *XXI.* 31, 387: 163

- Horace *Ep.* I, various passages, 195; I. 6. 5-8: 219.
Odes III. 4. 21 ff.: 125; IV. 12: 165. *Satires* I.
 4. 6 ff.: 9
 Juvenal III. 186-9: 172; VIII. 241: 60
 Livy XXXVII.: various passages: 140 f.; XLV. 12:
 127, 172
 Lucretius I. 657 f.: 136; II. 515-6: 63; V. 526 ff.:
 216; V. 1341-49: 122, 215
 Oppian *Hal.*, various passages: 16 ff.
Orph. Frag. (Kern), various passages: 118 9
 Ovid *Met.* VI. 392 ff.: 171; XII. 298: 61
Ox. Pap. XVII. 2078: 9; various passages: 131
 Pausanias IX. 29. 2: 62
 Persius III. 44-51: 63, 167
Pervigilium Veneris, 11, 21, 74: 242
 Petronius 76: 172
 Pindar *Nem.* VI. 1: 51. *Pyth.* viii. 136-7: 117
 Plato *Apol.* 21B, 27A: 58. *Epinomis*, various passages:
 147 f. *Rep.* 479C: 58. *Tim.* 37C: 170
 Plautus *Merc.* 1 ff.: 107; 660, 724-5, 881: 215.
M.G. 843: 20. *Persa* 624-5: 20. *Rud.* 598-602,
 602-610: 214. *Trin.* 242 ff.: 107
 Plutarch *Mor.* 25A: 130
 Polyaeus VI. 18: 120
 Silius Italicus V. 47 ff.: 16
 Sophocles *Ajax* 79, 121, 1355 ff.: 101. *El.* 1417: 101.
O.T. 439 f.: 58. *Phil.*, various passages: 55 f., 209 ff.
 Statius *Theb.* VIII. 666: 61
 Tacitus *Ann.* IV. 12: 217
 Terence *Eun.* 230: 63. *Phorm.* 330: 62
 Theocritus x. 26 ff.: 170; x. 50: 5. *Epig.* IV. 9 ff.: 5
 Thucydides II. 63-4: 102; VI. 64. 1: 169; VI. 93-5:
 103
 Varro *R.R.* II. 7. 9: 122b
 Velleius Paterculus II. 85: 61
 Virgil *Aen.* I. 146: 166; VIII. 104: 32. *Culex* 252-3:
 166. *Ecl.* IV. 18-20, IX. 35: 123, 124. *Georg.* II.
 277: 59; IV. 517: 63

III.—INDEX OF GREEK WORDS.

ἀλβαντες, 121
 αὐθάδεια, 115
 βίος 'livelihood,' 132

διαίτα, 6
 ἐν temporal, 7
 εὐθέτου, 53 f.

Κύβα, 161
 Κυβήβη, 161

μελίχλωρος, 170
 ναιετάω, 163

THE
CLASSICAL
REVIEW

EDITED BY
E. HARRISON AND W. M. CALDER

BOARD OF MANAGEMENT:

PROF. J. F. DOBSON, M.A. (*Chairman*)
PROF. H. WILLIAMSON, M.A. (*Hon. Treasurer*), L. WHIBLEY, M.A. (*Hon. Secretary*).
PROF. R. S. CONWAY, Litt.D., F.B.A.; PROF. A. C. CLARK, Litt.D., F.B.A.
E. A. BARBER, M.A.; PROF. D. S. ROBERTSON, M.A.

With the co-operation of PROF. E. K. RAND, Harvard University, and PROF.
W. RITCHIE, University of Cape Town.

VOLUME XLIII.

PUBLISHED FOR THE CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION
LONDON
JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE STREET, W.
NEW YORK
G. E. STECHERT & CO., 31-33, EAST 10TH STREET
1929

THE
CLASSICAL
REVIEW

EDITED BY
W. H. D. RUSSELL

C
S
Ja
A
Z
N
P
T
H
T
B
T
R

N
F
A
A
P
P
B
E
K
V
T
R

E

N
A
T
S
A
F
T
I

TABLE OF CONTENTS

No. 1.

| | PAGE | | PAGE |
|---|------|--|------|
| Campanarum Canticum | 1 | Reviews (continued): | |
| Sir John Murray | 1 | (Nairn-Laloy), A. D. KNOX, 24; <i>Indogermanische</i> | |
| Jane Ellen Harrison | 1 | <i>Grammatik</i> (Hirt), J. FRASER, 25; <i>Macedonian</i> | |
| Alexander William Mair | 2 | <i>Imperialism</i> (Jouguet), W. W. TARN, 27; <i>The</i> | |
| <i>Zētr Tōpavros</i> . G. THOMSON | 3 | <i>Greek Questions of Plutarch</i> (Halliday), M. CARY, | |
| Notes on Sophocles: <i>Philoctetes</i> . J. C. LAWSON | 5 | 28; <i>C. Iuli Caesaris Commentarii</i> , III. (Klotz), | |
| Plato and Poetical Justice. J. TATE | 7 | H. STEWART, 29; <i>Le Dialecte Laconien</i> (Bour- | |
| Two Notes on Herodes. A. D. KNOX | 8 | guet), R. MCKENZIE, 31; <i>Vergilio ad Enea</i> (Ter- | |
| Horace: <i>Odes</i> I. 34, 35. L. A. MACKAY | 10 | zaghi); <i>La Réalisme dans les Bucoliques de Virgile</i> | |
| Two Notes on Livy V. H. HILL | 12 | (Hubaux), S. K. JOHNSON, 32; <i>The Roman</i> | |
| <i>Bacchae</i> 925-6. G. C. RICHARDS | 15 | <i>Legions</i> (Parker), A. M. DUFF, 33; <i>The Social</i> | |
| Thucydides VI. 34, 7. A. W. GOMME | 15 | <i>and Economic History of the Roman Empire</i> (Ros- | |
| Reviews: | | tovtzeff), D. ATKINSON, 35; <i>Freedmen in the</i> | |
| <i>Some Versa Translations</i> , M. R. GLOVER, 16; | | <i>Early Roman Empire</i> (Duff), M. CARY, 36; <i>The</i> | |
| <i>A Cretan Statuette</i> (Wace), P. J. DIXON, 18; | | <i>Suasories of Seneca the Elder</i> (Edward), G. B. A. | |
| <i>Lawyers and Litigants in Ancient Athens</i> (Bon- | | FLETCHER, 37; <i>Sénèque, Des Bienfaits</i> , II. | |
| ner), E. W. V. CLIFTON, 19; <i>The Athenian</i> | | Préchac), G. B. A. FLETCHER, 38; <i>The Invasion</i> | |
| <i>Calendar in the Fifth Century</i> (Meritt), J. K. | | <i>of Europe by the Barbarians</i> (Bury), J. G. C. | |
| FOTHERINGHAM, 20; <i>Die Sprache des Redners</i> | | ANDERSON, 39; <i>The Romanesque Lyric</i> (Allen), | |
| <i>Hypereides</i> (Pohle), J. F. DONSON, 21; <i>Die Briefe</i> | | S. GASELER | 40 |
| <i>des Sokrates und der Sokratischer</i> (Köhler), A. E. | | Short Reviews | 40 |
| TAYLOR, 22; <i>Hellas the Forerunner</i> , II. (House- | | Summaries of Periodicals | 44 |
| hold), A. W. GOMME, 23; <i>Hérodas, Mimes</i> | | Books Received | 47 |

No. 2.

| | | | |
|--|----|--|----|
| Notes and News | 49 | Reviews (continued): | |
| From Horace (<i>Odes</i> I. xxxvii.). J. A. FORT | 51 | <i>Literary Criticism</i> (Rhys Roberts), J. D. DEN- | |
| A Strange Law at Sparta. A. D. KNOX | 52 | NISTON, 72; <i>Josephus: The Jewish War</i> (Thac- | |
| A Greek Inscription from Kurdistan (<i>C.I.G.</i> | | keray), G. W. BUTTERWORTH, 73; <i>Papyri</i> | |
| 4673). W. W. TARN | 53 | <i>Græcae Magicae</i> (Preisendanz), H. J. ROSE, 74; | |
| Plautus, <i>Bacchides</i> , 635-8. W. BEARE | 56 | <i>Plotinus: The Divine Mind</i> (Mackenna); <i>En-</i> | |
| Persius no 'Micher.' J. TATE | 56 | <i>néades</i> III., IV.; <i>La Philosophie de Plotin</i> (Bré- | |
| <i>Báβos</i> and <i>ββος</i> . W. RHYS ROBERTS | 59 | hier), S. C. NEILL, 75; <i>The Cambridge Ancient</i> | |
| Epexegetic γα. J. D. DENNISTON | 59 | <i>History</i> , VII., W. E. HEITLAND, 76; <i>Autour des</i> | |
| <i>καθάπερ καί, ὡς περ καί, ὅς περ καί</i> . J. D. DENNISTON | 60 | <i>Gracques</i> (Carcopino), M. CARY, 82; <i>Last</i> | |
| Varro and Orpheus. A. D. NOCK | 60 | <i>Words on the Roman Municipalities</i> (Heitland), | |
| The River of Tears again. H. J. ROSE | 61 | J. G. C. ANDERSON, 83; <i>The Commerce be-</i> | |
| Reviews: | | <i>tween the Roman Empire and India</i> (Warming- | |
| <i>Some Compositions</i> , A. D. NIGHTINGALE, 62; | | ton), J. O. THOMSON, 84; <i>Towards a Text of the</i> | |
| <i>Some Translations and other Books</i> , E. S. FOR- | | <i>Metamorphosis of Ovid</i> (Slater), E. H. ALTON, | |
| STER, 63; <i>The Classical Tradition in Poetry</i> | | 85; <i>De Litteris Latinis Commentarii</i> (de Rosa), | |
| (Murray), H. W. GARROD, 64; <i>Schallanalytische</i> | | J. WIGHT DUFF | 88 |
| <i>Versuche</i> (Ipsen-Karg), H. J. ROSE, 65; <i>Aristo-</i> | | Short Reviews | 89 |
| <i>phanes</i> (Coulon et van Daele), F. W. HALL, 66; | | Cambridge Philological Society | 93 |
| <i>The Greek Atomists and Epicurus</i> (Bailey), A. E. | | Summaries of Periodicals | 93 |
| TAYLOR, 68; <i>Strabo</i> , Vols. IV. and V. (Jones), | | Books Received | 96 |
| E. W. V. CLIFTON, 71; <i>Greek Rhetoric and</i> | | | |

No. 3.

| | | | |
|--|----|--|-----|
| Euripides the Irrationalist. E. R. DODDS | 97 | The Historical Significance of the Odes of | |
| | | Horace. E. R. GARNSEY | 104 |

No. 4.

| | | | |
|--|-----|---|-----|
| Notes and News | 113 | An Epigram from Cos. J. D. BRAZLEY AND | |
| A Law at Sparta. J. A. NAIRN | 114 | A. S. F. GOW | 120 |
| Three Notes on Pindar. W. A. STONE | 115 | Plutarch's <i>Quaestiones Graecae</i> , No. 24. M. P. | |
| Sophocles' <i>Antigone</i> 925, 926. E. C. WOODCOCK | 116 | NILSSON | 122 |
| Aristophanes, <i>Clouds</i> , ll. 994-995. E. C. YORKE | 117 | New Light on Catullus. E. H. MINNS AND E. | |
| Four Notes on Greek Particles. J. D. DEN- | | HARRISON | 123 |
| NISTON | 118 | IENTOZOZ. W. H. D. ROUSE | 125 |
| The Construction of Verbs of Thinking: A | | <i>Bacchae</i> , 925-6. G. C. RICHARDS | 125 |
| Reminder. E. C. MARCHANT | 120 | Hippocrates, π. τέχνη 5. J. D. DENNISTON | 125 |

| | PAGE |
|--|------|
| 'A Greek Inscription from Kurdistan': Postscript. W. W. TARN | 125 |
| Hyperborean Offerings. A. D. NOCK | 126 |
| Clarian Apollo. A. D. NOCK | 126 |
| Propertius II, 12. A. D. NOCK | 126 |

Reviews:

| | |
|--|--|
| <i>Nine Essays</i> (Platt), H. W. GARROD, 127; <i>Solon and Croesus</i> (Zimmern), M. N. TOD, 128; <i>Zygouris</i> (Blegen), M. BRAUNHOLTZ, 130; <i>Greek Vases in Poland</i> (Beazley), M. BRAUNHOLTZ, 132; <i>Hesiods</i> (Mazon), T. A. SINCLAIR, 133; <i>Sappho Revocata</i> (Edmonds), C. M. BOWRA, 135; <i>Studia Sapphica</i> (Turyn), E. LOBEL, 136; <i>Aristoteles' Gedanke der Philosophie</i> (Schilling-Wollny), A. E. TAYLOR, 137; <i>A Bibliography of the Poetics of Aristotle</i> (Cooper and Gudeman), H. B. CHARLTON, 138; <i>Greek Physical Education</i> (Forbes), E. N. GARDINER, 139; <i>The</i> | |
|--|--|

Reviews (continued):

| | |
|--|-----|
| <i>Philosophy of Plotinus, etc.</i> (Inge), E. R. DODDS, 140; <i>Sibylls and Seers</i> (Bevan), A. D. NOCK, 141; <i>Italy before the Romans</i> (Randall-MacIver), H. J. ROSE, 142; <i>Cicéron: L'Amitié</i> (Laurand), G. B. A. FLETCHER, 143; <i>C. Iulii Caesaris Commentarii</i> (Klotz), H. STEWART, 144; <i>Virgil: The Georgics in English Hexameters</i> (Brodrick), J. W. MACKAIL, 145; <i>Lucan</i> (Duff), A. SOUTER, 147; <i>The Attic Nights of Aulus Gellius</i> (Rolfe), D. S. ROBERTSON, 148; <i>Syntactica: Studien und Beiträge zur historischen Syntax des Lateins</i> (Löfstedt), W. B. ANDERSON, 149; <i>An Inventory of the Historical Monuments in London; Vol. III. Roman London</i> , J. A. PETCH | 150 |
| Short Reviews | 151 |
| Summaries of Periodicals | 154 |
| Books Received | 157 |

No. 5.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Notes and News | 161 |
| Alt-Ithaka. A. SHEWAN | 162 |
| Accents and the Greek Iambic Line. F. R. DALE | 165 |
| A Reference to Lucretius in Cicero, <i>Pro Milone</i> . M. E. HIRST | 166 |
| Catullus 66 51-4. A. E. HOUSMAN | 168 |
| Some Aids to Classical Teaching. W. E. P. PANTIN | 168 |

Reviews:

| | |
|--|--|
| <i>Andrew Lang's Work for Homer</i> (Shewan), G. MURRAY, 169; <i>Die Gesetze des Zaleukos und Charondas</i> (Mühl), P. N. URE, 170; <i>Some Greek Love Poems</i> (Edmonds), S. GASELEE, 172; <i>Greek Lyric Metre</i> (Thomson), H. D. F. KITTO, 173; <i>Pindar's Odes of Victory</i> (Billson), D. S. ROBERTSON, 174; <i>A Handbook of Greek and Roman Architecture</i> (Robertson), W. R. LETHBRIDGE, 175; <i>Die antike Menschheitsidee</i> (Mühl), R. B. ONIANS, 176; <i>Platonism</i> (Burnet), P. W. DODD, 178; <i>Demosthenes gegen Aphobos</i> (Schwahn), M. CARV, 179; <i>On Alexander's Trach to the Indus</i> (Stein), W. W. TARN, 180; <i>New Chapters in the History of Greek Literature; Second Series</i> | |
|--|--|

Reviews (continued):

| | |
|---|-----|
| (Powell and Barber), C. M. BOWRA, 181; <i>Anthologie Grecque, Tome I.</i> (Waltz), J. U. POWELL, 183; <i>Die Vorgeschichte der christlichen Taufe</i> (Reitzenstein), H. J. ROSE, 184; <i>The Emperor Romanus Lecapenus and his Reign</i> (Runciman), G. BUCKLER, 185; <i>Plotinus Kategorien der intelligiblen Welt</i> (Nebel); <i>Plotinus Leben</i> (Oppermann), E. R. DODDS, 186; <i>A History of Greece</i> (Robinson), M. CARY, 187; <i>Jephthah</i> (Christopherson), E. HARRISON, 189; <i>A Greek-English Lexicon, Part IV.</i> (Liddell and Scott), E. HARRISON, 189; <i>Hannibal als Politiker</i> (Groag), G. H. STEVENSON, 190; <i>Cicero: De Re Publica, De Legibus</i> (Keyes), G. B. A. FLETCHER, 191; <i>Cicero: The Letters to His Friends, Vols. I., II.</i> (Williams), W. T. VESEV, 191; <i>Ovide, Héroïdes</i> (Bornecque et Prévost), 194; <i>The Roman Fort at Old Kilpatrick</i> (Miller), D. ATKINSON, 197; <i>Some class-books</i> , W. E. P. PANTIN | 198 |
| Short Notices | 200 |
| Books Received | 207 |

No. 6.

| | |
|--|-----|
| Notes and News | 209 |
| Regulations for a Local Sports Meeting. E. NORMAN GARDINER | 210 |
| Vergil and the Maze. W. F. J. KNIGHT | 212 |
| Note on Herodotus IV. 108-9. M. CARY | 214 |
| Callimachus on Mimnermus. H. J. M. MILNE | 214 |
| The Dithyrambs of Xenocritus. W. M. CALDER | 214 |
| Tac. Agric. 24 init. W. H. SEMPLE | 214 |
| The Date of <i>I.B.M.</i> 493. H. BOX | 214 |

Reviews:

| | |
|---|--|
| <i>God, Man, and Epic Poetry</i> (Routh), R. B. ONIANS, 215; <i>Daedalus and Thespis</i> (Miller), D. S. ROBERTSON, 218; <i>A Commentary on Plato's Timaeus</i> ; <i>Plato, Timaeus and Critias</i> , translated (Taylor), J. L. STOCKS, 218; <i>Études sur quelques Particules de Liaison chez Platon</i> (des Places), J. D. DENNISTON, 220; <i>Epicuri et Epicureorum Scripta in Herculaneis Papyrus servata</i> (Vogliano), C. BAILEY, 222; <i>ΙΗΘΥΣ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΥΣ</i> | |
|---|--|

Reviews (continued):

| | |
|--|-----|
| OT ΒΑΣΙΛΕΥΤΕΑΣ (Eisler), A. D. NOCK, 224; <i>État actuel des études sur le rythme de la prose latine</i> (Novotný), H. D. BROADHEAD, 226; <i>L. Annaei Senecae Dialogorum liber VI.</i> (Favez); <i>Dvi Konsolace Senekovy</i> (Ryba), G. B. A. FLETCHER, 227; <i>Seneca: Moral Essays. I.</i> (Basore), G. B. A. FLETCHER, 229; <i>The Romanization of Africa Proconsularis</i> (Broughton), J. G. C. ANDERSON, 230; <i>Some annuals</i> , E. HARRISON, 231; <i>A Book of Latin Prose and Latin Verse</i> (Wright), W. E. P. PANTIN, 232; <i>Some class-books</i> , H. LISTER | 232 |
| Short Reviews | 233 |
| Summaries of Periodicals | 245 |
| Books Received | 246 |
| Index | 247 |

150
151
154
157

198
200
207

232
233
243
246
247